Pulastya-Smṛti-Saṅgraha पुलस्त्य-स्मृति-सङ्ग्रह

(Pulastya and his Smṛtis)

Prof. Smt. Krishna Kanti Gopal
Prof. Lallanji Gopal



RISHI PUBLICATIONS

76, Chandrika Colony, Varanasi - 221010 INDIA Published by:-RISHI PUBLICATIONS 76, Chandrika Colony, Varanasi - 221010 India. BL1226 .2 .p850 1992

© Pushkal Gopal

1992

Rs.195/- \$ 40.00 £ 25.00

ISBN: 81 - 85193 - 13 - 4

Composed at :-Khandelwal Press & Publications, Manmandir, Varanasi.

Printed at :-



वागंर्थाविव संपृक्तौ वागर्थप्रतिपत्तये । जगतः पितरौ वन्दे पार्वतीपरमेश्वरौ॥

- कृष्णकान्तिलल्लनजीगोपालौ।

*** * ***

Contents

	Preface	i - iii
1.	Introduction - Pulastya in history and tradition (1) Name (2) Pulastya the sage (3) Pulastya and his family (4) Date and historicity (5) Place (6) Pulastya and Purāṇas (7) Pulastya and Sāṅkhya (8) Pulastya in Dhamaśāstra tradition	1
2.	The Pulastyasmṛti: the reconstructed text (1) Sources (2) Survival of text (3) Problems of reconstruction (4) Nature of the text: Dharmasūtra or Smṛti (5) Two works of Pulastya (6) Reconstruction of the text: its contents.	25
3.	(A) The date of the Pulastyasmṛti (1) Kane's view (2) The recognition of Pulastya as a Smṛti writer (3) Pulastya's contemporaries (4) Tirthayatrāparva and Pulastyasmṛti (5) Padmapurāṇa and Pulastyasmṛti (6) Internal evidence- (i) Development of Dharmaśāstra literature (ii) Kṛṣṇājinadāṇa (iii) Week-day (iv) Fourfold classification of sannyāsins (v) Religious condition: Vaiṣṇavism and religious eclecticism; Gaṅgā and Tirthas, Pāṣaṇḍins or Buddhists.	47

4.	The <i>Pulastya-upasmṛti</i>	78
	(1) Contents	
	(2) Comparison with Bhavisya- purāṇa and Agnipurāṇa	
	(3) Date	
	(4) Pulastya-upasmṛti distinct from Pulastyasmṛti	
	(5) Importance of the <i>Pulastya-upasmṛti</i> :	
	(a) Fivefold dharma	
	(b) Authority of the Smrtis	
	(c) Smārtadharma as theme.	
5.	Text of Pulastyasmṛṭi (Reconstructed)	96
6.	Text of Pulastya-upasmṛti	119
7.	Appendix:	124
	IA- Pulastya on Parvatadāna	
	IB- Pulastya on Pañcadhenudāna	
	IIA- Pulastya on Viśvavrata	
	IIB- Pulastya on Lakṣminārāyaṇavrata	
	IIC- Pulastya on Ghṛtasnānavrata	
	III- Pulastya on Tirthayātrā.	
8.	Sanskrit texts consulted	151

Preface

The Dharmaśāstra literature is voluminous and is rich in significant information. But, it has not received proper attention from historians studying social life. It is, no doubt, normative in character, but normative writings are not without relevance for reconstructing the past. They are rooted in the realities of contemporary social life and condition its shape and future course.

The apathy towards the Dharmaśāstra literature resulted from the nature of its exposure to the enthusiastic British scholars and administrators during the times of the East India Company. They took a few Smṛtis, commentaries and digests to represent the socio-legal texts of India. They could not apprehend the nature of this literature, its vastness and the varied dimensions of its scope.

The earlier Smṛtis, of Manu and Yājñavalkya in particular, dwarfed the other Smṛti texts. Some of these had a limited span of coverage of topics and, thus, had a restricted applicability. Modern scholarship harbours the notion that the Smṛti texts envisage a social system, structure and point of view which is set and standardised, leaving little scope for deviations. The individual Smṛtis cannot be expected to record major variations of facts and changes of views. The varying factors of the author, his time and his place, thus, become of not much consequence.

Some of these Smrtis blacked out in course of centuries. They are no longer available in their original form, and have survived as fragmentary quotations scattered in the very rich medieval Nibandhas, but only a small number of Nibandha texts have acquired a printed form. This has prevented a total evaluation of the Smrti texts and their bearing on various problems of social life and institutions. The quotations indicate that the number of these texts was by no means small. A systematic collation of the quotations is expected to give some inkling of the nature of these texts and their significant views.

The Nibandha works very forcefully demonstrate that the prevailing assumption of the Smrtis subscribing to a monotonously uniform and rigid set of provisions or views is not valid. Individual variations in respect of not only minor points but also major issues can be discerned in these quotations. Sometimes we find the minor Smrtis effectively going against the established views of recognised Smrtis.

The reconstruction of the Smrtis out of the surviving quotations is expected to provide several fresh and useful texts for social history, which may throw light on the contours of social change, even if they are not as bold and prominent as we wish them to be.

The desirability of this type of research was felt long back, but very few systematic efforts could materialise. The reconstruction of the Smṛtis attributed to Sankha-Likhita, Hārīta, Vyāsa and Kātyāyana had a limited scope of topics and concentrated on the few works available then. It was only in the case of the *Bṛhaspatismṛti* that K.V.R. Aiyangar attempted a model exercise. Kane's attempt in regard to the *Kātyāyana smṛti* threw up an equally imitable model, even though it was confined to the verses on *vyavahāra*.

In the course of our studies on Pulastya as a Dharmaśāstra writer we have identified two texts attributed to him. Of these the earlier one is not available in its original form, but has now been reconstructed by piecing together the available quotations. The other text, though published first in 1883, has remained ignored and could not be noticed even by Kane.

The first *Pulastyasmṛti* was a fuller text covering several aspects of the varied subject matter of Dharmaśāstra. Besides the treatment of the topics of āhnika ācara, dāna, śuddhi, prāyaścitta and śraddha appear to have been quite elaborate, Besides these the text had separate chapters on devapūjā, the special type of kṛṛṣṇājina dāna, purification on being bitten by animals, purification on contact with a pāṣaṇḍin, and the funeral rites for ascetics,

The second Smrti, which we have named as the *Pulastya-upasmrti*, is among the first to discuss the nature of Dharma treated in the Smrtis, its five divisions, and the meaning and authority of the Smrti injunctions.

The uncertainty about the precise date for the composition of the Smrti texts generally has necessitated a discussion of all possible indications to reduce the time-brackets for the two texts. The desirability of a detailed and minute probing has been accentuated by the wild views recently floated on slender, and often flimsy grounds, about the dates of the Smrti texts. We have argued to place the *Pulastyasmrti* in the time-bracket A.D. 300-500, preferably its later part A.D. 400-500. For the *Pulastya-upasmrti* we have suggested the date A.D. 650-700.

The Smrti texts in many cases have a clear appearance of being eponymous writings. Evidently they could not have been composed by the ancient sages and hoary personalities, whose names are prefixed to them, but who have been turned into mythological figures. The texts cannot be pushed back to the period traditionally assigned to their supposed authors. It is difficult to believe on historical grounds that Manu, Nārada, Bṛhaspati, Uśanas, Yama and others could have actually written the Smṛtis attributed to them. But, there must have been some cogent reasons for attributing the texts to them. In the present case we have attempted an exercise to remove the layers of mythology which obscure the historical personality of

Pulastya. The accounts in the Epics and the Purāṇas, when subjected to a judicious critical analysis, yield elements of the historical kernel. Pulastya has his claims to historicify. He made significant contributions to the Dharmaśāstra tradition. The Purāṇas assign him a place of honnour and he was accepted as a Sāṅkhya thinker of distinction.

We have added a number of appendices recording the views of Pulastya on several special *dānas* (Parvatadāna and Pañcadhenudāna) and *vratas* and also his introducing the cult of pilgrimage.

On this occasion of the completion of an endeavour, which we undertook thirty years back, and, whose progress had been dogged by various problems created by institutional situations, other academic commitments and personal requirements, we fondly remember moments, which have given us courage, and friends, who have inspired us to persist. Those whose help of various sorts have contributed to the finalisation of this research work include late Sri Gopal Ram Tripathi, Dr. M.C. Joshi, Dr. I.C. Vishwakarma and Dr. M. D. Dubey. Sri Ullas Sharma of the Rishi Publications has succeeded in overcoming our hesitations about an early publication of the monograph.

9, Gurudham Colony, Varanasi-221010. Sivarātri March 2, 1992.

Krishna Kanti Gopal Lallanji Gopal

Chapter ·1

Introduction: Pulastya in History and Tradition

The Dharmaśāstra literature is very vast. Only a small part of it has been published. Much of it still remains in the form of manuscripts. Many early texts composed as Smrtis have not survived and are known only through quotations in later works.

P.V.Kane, in his monumental *History of Dharmaśāstra*, has utilised all the available Dharmaśāstra writings, even if they happen to be in the form of manuscripts. On the basis of his vast study Kane has introduced many Smṛti texts, which are no longer available in their original shape. The Smṛtis listed in Volume 1 of his work include one under the name of Pulastya ¹. Kane has pointed out a few quotations from Pulastya occurring in medieval commentaries and digests. These quotations clearly show that in ancient times there was a Smṛti text under the name of Pulastya which dealt with several topics generally covered in a Smṛti.

1. Name

The name of the Smṛtikāra in all cases is given as Pulastya by the authors of the Nibandhas and the commentaries. The only exceptions are the $\overline{Ac\bar{a}rendu}^2$ and $T\bar{i}rthacint\bar{a}mani^3$ which mention the name of Paulastya. We cannot attribute the verses in question to another author different from Pulastya. That these quotations also were taken from the Pulastyasmṛti is indicated by the fact that the $Nrsimhiya-prayoga-p\bar{a}rij\bar{a}ta^4$ attributes to Pulastya the verses which the $Ac\bar{a}rendu$ ascribes to Paulastya. As all other authorities take the name to be Pulastya, the form Paulastya is evidently a mistake. It is, however, not unlikely that the authors of the $Ac\bar{a}rendu$ and $T\bar{i}rthacint\bar{a}mani$ possibly did not consider the ancient sage Pulastya to be the author of the Smṛti. They took it to be the composition of a person who belonged to the lineage of Pulastya and hence named him as Paulastya.

Tradition records the name of Pulaha also as a sage. Linguistically Pulastya can be transformed into Pulaha. But, the two are not to be mixed up. Tradition mentions them as two different persons, and, in many cases, they are referred to together in the same context. Manu 5 includes both Pulastya and Pulaha in the list of the ten Prajāpatis. In the Mahābhārata their names appear together at many places 6, among the mental progenies of Brahma, the six powerful maharsis, the seven citra-sikhandi-rsis, the eight prakrtis and the twenty-one Prajāpatis. Both are said to have been present in Indra's assembly and as sitting in Brahmā's assembly to worship him. Both attended the birth celebrations of Arjuna and Skanda, both went to the rākṣasa-satra of Parāśara, and both approached Bhiṣma when he was to leave his body. The difference between the two is clearly brought out by the other details associated with them. In the Dharmaśāstra tradition also they are mentioned as two different Dharmaśāstra writers. The list of twenty-one other Smṛtikāras, occurring in the Prayogapārijāta,7 contains the names of both Pulastya and Pulaha.

The Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition gives a very interesting account of the role of Pulastya in Indian history. His personality is a strange mixture of mythical elements and historical facts.

2. Pulastya the sage

Pulastya is included in a list of eight *rṣis* revered as mind-born sons of Brahmā⁸. The Brāhmaṇa families are said to have descended from these *rṣis*. A further element of myth is introduced in the narrative of these sages by saying that Pulastya, Pulaha and Kratu, among the mind-born sages, did not found true Brāhmaṇa families. Their lines became extinct, but, because each of them adopted an Āgastya, their names were included in the Agastya *gotra* as three separate *pravaras*⁹. The Rākṣasas, Vānaras (monkey people), Kinnaras (bird people) and Yakṣas (supernatural beings) are mentioned as the offsprings of Pulastya ¹⁰. Pulaha was the progenitor of Kimpuruṣas, Piśācas, goblins, lions, tigers and other animals. Kratu is generally described as a celibate, without any wife or child, but, in some accounts, the Vālakhilyas are mentioned as his offsprings.

In the Vedic literature we find references to seven priestly families or vamsas or mūla-gotras. These seven oldest priestly

families were Bhārgavas, Āngirasas, Ātreyas, Kāśyapas, Vāsiṣṭhas, Āgastyas and Kauṣikas¹¹. But the family of Pulastya is not included in the list of the Vedic families.

The fact that the name of Pulastya was included in the list of sages in the Itihāsa-Purāṇa texts shows that Pulastya received recognition in a later period. From the Vedic literature we do not get any details about his historical personality. This creates the impression that he was a creation of the later Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition.

John E. Mitchiner ¹² has pointed out that there are two main lists of the seven *rṣis*. The first, found in the *Kalpasūtras*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* and some of the Purāṇas, names the seven *rṣis* as Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Gautama, Atri, Vasiṣṭha and Kaśyapa. The second main list, as found in certain portions of the Epics and the Purāṇas, identifies them as Marici, Atri, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vasiṣṭha. According to Mitchiner, the formulation of the second list was the work of certain Brāhmaṇa *gotras* living to the south of the Vindhyas between c. 100 B.C. and A.D. 200. But, there is no definite evidence to confirm the role of the *gotras* and the specified region in the formulation of the list in the specified period¹³.

The tradition reveres Pulastya as one of the ancient sages (brahmarṣis). His importance is indicated by the fact that he was considered to be one of the mind-born sons of Brahmā ¹⁴. The Mahābhārata mentions his name in the lists of the mental progenies of Brahmā, the six maharṣis. the seven citra-śikhaṇḍi ṛṣis, the eight prakṛtis and twenty-one prajāpatis¹⁵.

The *Mahābhārata* has different accounts of the mental sons of Brahmā in which their names and numbers vary ¹⁶. We have references to their number being six ¹⁷ or nine ¹⁸. But, usually they are stated to be seven in number ¹⁹. According to Hopkins ²⁰, six was the traditional number of the mental sons of Brahmā; the number was raised to eight to accord it with the eight number of *prakṛtis*. The number was raised to seven because the mental progenies were confused with the seven *rṣis*. ²¹

The rsis are said to belong to different categories in accordance with their status. There are maharsis, devarsis, paramarsis, rājarsis and brahmarsis. On account of their prestige they were raised to the position of devas and pitrs and, thus, came to acquire a semi-

mythical character. The process of the transformation of the *rsis* into *pitrs* can be discerned is some cases ²². In the *Rgveda* ²³ we find that there were many ancestors other than those who had a share in the *soma* drink. These seem to have formed the basis of the fourfold division of ancestors by Manu ²⁴. Manu mentions the progenies of Kavi, Angiras, Pulastya and Vasiṣṭha as being respectively the *somapā*, *haviṣmat*, *ājyapā* and *sukālin* ancestors.

The position of Pulastya in the list of the mental progenies of Brahmā also used to change. Sometimes he is mentioned as third ²⁵, but, in many cases, he is fourth ²⁶. The *Manusmrti* ²⁷ says that Brahmā divided himself into two halves, one male and the other female. From female he produced Virāj. Through austerities Virāj produced Svāyambhuva Manu. In his work of creation Svāyambhuva first produced ten *prajāpatis*, the great sages. Of these Pulastya was the fourth.

In the *Purāṇas* the mythical character of Pulastya was further emphasised. His name occurs in the list of the *prajāpatis*²⁸ and eight mental progenies ²⁹ of Brahmā. A new element was added to the traditional account, when it was said that Pulastya came out of the ears of Brahmā ³⁰. The *Matsyapurāna* ³¹ has a story that many sons of Brahmā died as a result of the curse of Sankara, Pulastya being one of them.

We, thus, see that Pusastya, a *brahmarsi*, enjoyed a high respect. His prestige contributed to his recognition as a *pitr*. Tradition wove mythologies around his name and converted him into a mental progeny of Brahmā and later into one of the *prajāpatis*. Slowly his historical existence was completely obscured by the mythological coverings.

3. Pulastya and his family

The Itihsāsa-Purāna tradition has preserved varying and confusing accounts about Pulastya and his family. They are particularly confused about the position of his son Viśravas, the wives of the latter, and the progenies born to them³².

Pulastya is said to have married Prīti, a daughter of Dakṣa. The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*³³ mentions Dānāgni, Devabāhu and Atri as her sons. But, in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* ³⁴ we find the name of Dambholi (Agastya) as born of her. In the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* the name of

Pulastya's wife appears as Havirbhū whose sons were Agastya and Viśravas³⁵. Yet another tradition in the Epics speaks of his marriage with Gau³⁶ or Ilavilā, the daughter of king Tṛṇabindu³⊓. Vaiśravaṇa is mentioned as the son of Gau and Viśravas of Ilavilā³⁶. Thus, in the case of both of his sons, Agastya and Viśravas, we have two conflicting traditions about the names of their mothers.

The Rāmāyana ³⁹ narrates the story of the marriage of Pulastya with the daughter of king Tmabindu. Pulastya was performing penance in a hermitage which was frequented by apsarases and damsels on account of its natural beauty. Enraged by the constant disturbance, he put a curse that any woman, coming within his sight, will become pregnant at once, The princess⁴⁰, on entering the hermitage of the sage, came under the influence of the curse. When she reported her physical change to her father, he requested Pulastya to marry her. Pulastya did accordingly. According to the Rāmāyana Viśravas was the son of Pulastya from this wife and was known as Paulastya ⁴¹. He married Devavarnini, the daughter of the great sage Bharadvāja. Vaiśravaṇa was the issue of this union⁴².

The Mahābhārata tradition says that Vaiśravana, Pulastya's son born of his wife Gau, deserted his father. He became lord of Rāksasas and King of Kings in Lankā. Pulastya, to revenge himself upon Vaiśravana, begot of himself another son Viśravas, who was the embodiment of half of Pulastya himself. Viśravas disliked Vaiśravana, who, in order to win the favour of Viśravas, sent to him three women Puspotkață, Mālini and Rākā 43. The names of the wives of Viśravas and their issues are mentioned differently in different sources. Thus, whereas Kaikasi and Puspotkațā are mentioned separately (see Bhargava), it has been pointed out that Kaikasi herself was known as Keśini or Puspotkatā (see Walker). The name of Mālinī is dropped by some (Bhargava). All these wives of Viśravas belonged to the Rāksasa families. Kaikasi is said to have been the daughter of the Rāksasa chief Sumālin and his wife Ketumati (Walker). But, according to another version (Bhargava), Kaikasi was the daughter of the Rākṣasa chief Mālin, and Puṣpotkaṭā and Rākā were the daughters of the Rākṣasa chief Sumālya. Besides Devavamini, the Rāmāyana mentions only Kaikasi as the wife of Viśravas. The text gives the family table of Kaikasi; Rākā, Puspotkatā and Kumbhinasi were her sisters44. She was asked by

her father Sumālin to go and marry herself Viśravas, the son of Pulastya⁴⁵. According to the *Mahābhārata*, Puṣpotkaṭā was the mother of Rāvaṇa and Kumbhakarṇa, Mālini of Vibhiṣaṇa, and Rākā of the twins, Khara and Sūrpaṇakhā⁴⁶. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*⁴⁷ Rāvaṇa (Daśagrīva), Kumbhakarṇa, Sūrpaṇakhā and Vibhiṣaṇa are said to have been born of Kaikasī. From Puṣpotkaṭā were born Mahodara, Prahasta, Mahāparśva, Khara and a daughter named Kumbhinasī. Rākā was the mother of Triśiras, Dūṣaṇa, Vidyujjihva and a daughter named Asalikā⁴⁸.

We get some other names of the wives of Pulastya. The Piśitāśana or the flesh-eating ghouls are said to have been born of his wife Nikaṣā and hence were also known as Naikaṣeya or Nikaṣātmajas. Devavarṇini is mentioned as another wife of Viśravas. She was the daughter of a certain Bṛhaspati, who seems to have been a Yakṣa. From her was born Kubera, the king of the Yakṣas, whose son was Nalakubera.

The *Matsyapurāṇa*⁴⁹ records a tradition that, as most of the progenies of Viśravas were of the Rākṣasa species, Pulastya adopted an Āgastya as his son.

The chronological confusion in the traditional account of Pulastya shows a vital difference about Kubera. In one tradition Vaiśravana Kubera is mentioned as the son of Pulastya himself. Another tradition refers to him as the son of Viśravas, another son of Pulastya. Pulastya is said to have blessed Vaiśravana, the son of Viśravas, to become the master of wealth. 50

The Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition mentions many details about Pulastya which have an evidently mythological trait. Thus, in the *Mahābhārata* he is mentioned as being present in the palace of both Indra ⁵¹ and Brahmā. ⁵² He is also said to have been present at the investiture of Skanda ⁵³.

There are some other details about Pulastya in the texts, but they are not of much help in determining his chronological position. He is said to have prevailed upon Parāśara to end his Rākṣasa sacrifice⁵⁴. He is included in the list of people from whom Viśvāvasu, the Gandharva chief, is said to have received instructions in Sānkhya philosophy⁵⁵.

The Mahābhārata refers to Pulastya as being present on several occasions connected with events in the life of some of the important

characters in the story of the Epic. He was present at the birth of Arjuna 56. Nārada narrates to Yudhiṣṭhira how earlier, when Bhīṣma was young, Pulastya appeared and narrated to him the religious merit of visiting tīrthas 57. Later, when Bhīṣma was lying wounded, Pulastya is mentioned as one of the rṣis who surrounded him 58. But, it is to be noted that Pulastya does not play any direct and active part in the Mahābhārata story. He is only an ornamental figure adding to the grace of the occasion by his presence. It is as one of the hoary sages that he is mentioned on the occasion of the birth of Arjuna and in the death scene of Bhīṣma. It is, thus, clear that Pulastya could not have been contemporaneous with the main event in the Mahābhārata story. Even when he is mentioned in the context of the young days in the life of Bhīṣma, he does not have a historical nature. He has a supranatural character and appears before Bhīṣma to instruct him about the secret method of tīrthayātrā practised by the ṛṣis.

It is in the *Rāmāyaṇa* story that Pulastya is said to have had an active and direct participation in many events. The events of his life extend from the times of Tṛṇabindu to Rāma and Rāvaṇa. He marries the daughter of Tṛṇabindu⁵⁹. He went to the hermitage of Budha when he was discussing the question of imparting manhood to Ila⁶⁰. He blesses Vaiśravaṇa, the son of Viśravas ⁶¹. He actively intervenes in two events concerning Rāvaṇa, another son of Viśravas. He was the mediator for settling the differences between Rāvaṇa and Māndhatā⁶². He is also said to have freed Rāvaṇa from Kārtavirya Arjuna⁶³. Later, he is said to have been present at the court of Rāma when Sītā sworc⁶⁴.

4. Date and historicity

Pargiter 65 does not believe in the correctness of the references to Pulastya as a primeval rsi. Attaching credence to the narrative which makes him a contemporary of Tmabindu, he accepts the historicity of Pulastya.

The position of Tṛṇabindu is fixed. In the Rāmāyaṇa⁶⁶ he is described as a rājarṣi. The list of famous kings in the Epics and the Purāṇas includes Tṛṇabindu as one of the two renowned kings belonging to the Viśala kingdom.⁶⁷ From his queen Alambuṣā⁶⁸ he had a son Viśāla and a daughter Ilavilā who was married to Viśravas. The chronological position of Tṛṇabindu and Viśāla⁶⁹ can indicate the

date of Pulastya. They belonged to the Solar dynasty of Vaiśāli traced back to Nābhānedista, a son of Manu. 70 Bhalandana and Vatsapri are mentioned as the first two kings of the line. Marutta was one of the greatest kings of the dynasty, which has a regular list beginning with his son Narisyanta, whose son was Dama. Viśāla is said to have founded a city which came to be known as Viśālā or Vaiśali 71 after him. The $R\bar{a}m\bar{a}yana^{72}$ mentions the names of the successors of Viśāla as Hemacandra, Sucandra, Dhūmrāśva, Smjaya, Sahadeva, Kuśāśva, Somadatta, Kākutstha and Sumati. On the basis of the Puranic evidence Pargiter 73 gives the names of the last two kings as Janamejaya and Pramati. Sumati (or Pramati) was a contemporary of Daśaratha. Viśvāmitra, along with Rāma and Laksmana, on his way to Mithila, is said to have halted for a night in Sumati's city and to have been received by him.74 The synchronism of Sumati with Daśaratha and Rāma will imply that Pulastya, the contemporary of Trnabindu and Viśāla, has to be placed during the reigns of Sarvakāma, Sudāsa or Mitrasaha-Kalmāṣapāda of the Ikṣvāku dynasty of Ayodhyā. Thus, there will be a gap of eight or nine generations between Rāvana (and Daśaratha and Rāma) and Pulastya (and Trnabindu and Viśāla).

P.L. Bhargava 75 tries to restore historical order in the accounts about Pulastya. According to him, Viśravas was not the son of Pulastya, but was eighth in descent from him. The argument is that as Rāvaṇa was a contemporary of Rāma and Daśaratha, his father Viśravas must have been a contemporary of Daśaratha's father Aja. Pulastya is known to have been a contemporary of Viśāla, the brother of Ilavilā, who founded the kingdom of Vaiśāli. Thus, there seems to have been a gap of several generations between Pulastya and Viśravas, and the latter could not have been the son of Pulastya.

There is nothing inherently improbable in Pulastya being active during the times of Viśravas, Vaiśravana (Kubera) and Rāvaṇa. A person can be expected to be alive during the life time of his grandsons. Pulastya could have actively participated in the events connected with Rāvaṇa.

But, the fact that Pulastya was a contemporary of Tmabindu, the father of Ilavilā and Viśāla, will require us to explain the gap of eight generations, that separate Rāvaṇa and Rāma from Viśāla, to make all the references historically feasible. Either we reject the historicity of

some of these references or else we postulate a gap, at some stage, either between Pulastya and Viśravas, or between Viśravas and his many progenies. Following P.L. Bhargava, it may be suggested that Viśravas was a later descendent of Pulastya, but was converted into a direct descendent by the tradition. Another possibility is that he was the son of Pulastya, but, in explaining the efflorescence and multiplication of the many branches of the descendents of Pulastya, the tradition made Viśravas father them all.

It is to be seen that Pulastya has a shadowy existence in the events concerning his grandsons. He blesses Vaiśravana Kubera and prophesies about his greatness76. His role in pacifying the differences between Māndhātā and Rāvana does not seem to have much historical basis, because the contemporaneity of the two principal characters is itself suspect π . In the episode concerning Kārtavīrva Arjuna Pulastya is said to have heard about the captivity of Rāvana from the divine beings in the heaven⁷⁸ and to have reached Māhiṣmatī by the aerial route and flying at the speed of wind79. The reference to Pulastya repairing to the Brahmaloka after liberating Rāvana from Kārtavīrya Arjuna⁸⁰ suggests that by that time Pulastya had come to acquire a mythological character.81 His presence at the court of Rāma was not out of any historical necessity, but was the result of the traditional reputation of the sage. Thus, we would be inclined to attach greater historical authenticity to Pulastya's associations with Trnabindu and his princess. He behaves like a real human being. He practises austerities, gets angry because of the disturbances, and marries the dauthter of a king.

But, we differ with P.L. Bhargava as regards the position of Viśravas in the family list. Viśravas does not play any significant role in the life of his many progenies. He remains a shadowy figure. Rāvaṇa is sometimes mentioned as a scion of Pulastya (Paulastya-kulanandana)⁸², but the name of Viśravas does not occur in such casual references. Though reputed as a sage (muni), he does not perform any act in consonance with his character. Possibly his name was used as a cover to explain the many branches of Rākṣasa families and semi-mythological beings. The story of his creation by Pulastya from one half of his body ⁸³ imparts him a semi-mythological character like that of his father Pulastya. To bring him nearer in time to Rāvaṇa and other rākṣasas the Rāmāyaṇa says that his first son

Vaiśravana from his wife Devavarnini, the daughter of Bharadvāja, performed austerities for thousands of years which passed as they were really one year⁸⁴. To account for the birth of the Rākṣasa chiefs from him the long line of Rākṣasas beginning with Heti, his son Vidyutkeśa, grandson Sukeśa and great-grandsons Mālyavān, Sumāli and Māli and their numerous progenies are listed85. The marriage of Viśravas with the daughter of Sumāli does not take place in the ordinary course. In a chapter, which has the appearance of a fresh and independent narrative, Sumāli, the rāksasa, who came out from the nether land and was wandering on the earth, is said to have seen Dhaneśvara (Kubera Vaiśravana) flying on the Puspaka to his father, the son of Pulastya. He asks his daughter Kaikasi to devote herself to the great sage Viśravas and to marry him. She approaches him and says that the sage can know her purpose through his spiritual knowledge. Viśravas knows her purpose and prophesies that she will give birth to cruel rākṣasas and a pious son as the youngest. It is clear from the account that, at the time of his marriage with Kaikasi, Viśravas was a very old man of legendary fame. We have to provide for years of his austerities, thousands of years of austerities of his son Vaiśravana and latter's tenure as Kubera. The account gives a clear impression that unusual details have been imagined to provide for the marriage of Kaikasi with Viśravas, who belonged to a period long long before her own time, so that the birth of the many cruel rākṣasas is explained. Viśravas, referred to as Pulastya-tanayaand Paulastya, thus, seems to have been nearer in time to Pulastya, than to the later descendents of Pulastya. It may be suggested that tradition omitted several generations of insignificant descendents of Pulastya and traced the family tree as directly growing from his son Viśravas through his many wives.

According to the Puranic evidence Tmabindu ruled in the beginning of the third quarter of the Tretā age ⁸⁶. Pargiter ⁸⁷ shows that this suits other relevant chronological indications. Thus, Karandhama, the twelfth king preceding Tmabindu in the Vaiśāla dynasty, is said to have reigned at the beginning of the Tretā age⁸⁸. In his comparative chronological table Pargiter assigns Nos. 38 and 52 to Karandhama and Tmabindu which practically agrees with the approximate limits assigned to that age by him.

We may, thus, place Pulastya eight generations before the times

of Rāvaṇa and Dāśarathi Rāma. The time gap between Pulastya and Rāma is indicated in the *Rāmāyaṇa* ⁸⁹ when Pulastya is said to have belonged to the Kṛtayuga, a period much earlier than that of Rāma. There is a hotly contested controversy about the exact date of Rāma. The traditional evidence has been variously interpreted to suggest widely different dates. As this is not the direct task of our present study, we leave the discussion without deriving the final date on the basis of the Tṛṇabindu-Viśāla equation and its links with the times of Rāvana and Rāma.

A natural question arises about the historicity of Pulastya. Our information about him is derived from the Rāmāyana, Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. In assessing the historicity of any name or event known from the Itihāsa-Purāṇa texts the general practice has been to seek epigraphic or numismatic confirmation. For periods, which do not yield any inscription or coin, corroboration in other texts is also considered to be a safe basis. For the early periods the Vedic literature can provide the only evidence of confirmation. Scholars generally take only those names and events to be historically authentic which have some allusion in the Vedic texts. The case of others, not covered by the Vedic texts, will always remain suspect.

Pulastya will appear to be a semi-historical figure on account of the absence of any direct or indirect reference to him in the early Vedic literature. The period, to which Pulastya is to be assigned, on the basis of the available references, will fall within the chronological span of the Vedic texts.

In support of Pulastya it may be submitted that he is evidenced not by one single text but by the entire Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition, the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and many Purāṇas. The Itihāsa-Purāṇa texts, no doubt, received their present form very late, not before the early centuries of the Christian era. But, the texts seem to have originated many centuries back. The Itihāsa-Purāṇa literature has an antiquity going back to the Vedic times. It is on account of the non-availability of an early text of the Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition that Pulastya appears to have emerged late in history and to have been a later creation. But, this is partially compensated by the fact that the Itihāsa-Purāṇa traditon has a respected antiquity and is known to have preserved much ancient material.

We may offer an excuse for the Vedic literature being silent about

Pulastya. As we have discussed below⁹⁰, Pulastya had connexions with the Sānkhya system. We know that there is some ancient evidence, accepted by some modern scholars, describing Sānkhya to be a-Vedic, if not completely anti-Vedic⁹¹. This may be one reason for the Vedic literature not taking cognisance of Pulastya and his socio-religious views. Another reason may be that the religious practices of *tīrtha-yātrā*, *dāna* and *vrata*, which Pulastya seems to have propagated, are characteristic of the Puranic religion as opposed to the Vedic practices. These Puranic practices appear to have been a later development. But, there are indications that they had an early origin. On the basis of the evidence, surviving in the Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition, Pulastya can be recognised as one of the early supporters of these Puranic rites. The Vedic circle could not have looked with approval on these new trends, and, hence, ignored Pulastya.

5. Place

Our sources do not contain any reference to the place to which Pulastya belonged. In Sri Lanka there exists an ancient city named Pulastinagara, but it could not have derived its name from its association with Pulastya. It is not unlikely that a later descendent of the royal family beginning with Vibhisana established the city and, to reassert his connexions with the illustrious sage Pulastya, named it after him⁹².

The locations of some of the descendents of Pulastya are mentioned in some sources ⁹³. Most of them are assoicated with south India and Lankā ⁹⁴. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* ⁹⁵ Vaiśravaṇa, the son of Viśravas, on being appointed the fourth *lokapāla* and the Keeper of the Treasury, asked his father for a suitable place where he could settle. Viśravas advised him to settle in the city of Lankā, situated on the Trikūṭa mountain on the banks of the southern ocean. According to another tradition, Vaiśravaṇa, the son of Pulastya, rebelled against his father and then Prajāpati (Brahmā) appointed him *dhaneśa* and *lokapāla* and established him in Lankā ⁹⁶. The association of Viśravas with the *rākṣasas* can be an indication of his migrating to the south. Some passages connect Pulastya's *rākṣasa* descendents with the Himalayan region ⁹⁷. Kubera is also associated with Lankā in some passages of the two epics ⁹⁸, but his usual habitat is often

mentioned as the Himalayan region ⁹⁹. This could have been due to the traditional association of the *rākṣasas*with Lankā and of the gods (including Kubera) with the Himalayas. The habitation of the later Paulastyas need not be the original home of Pulastya.

According to a *Mahābhāratd*¹⁰⁰ passage Pulastya's son Viśravas lived on the banks of the Narmadā. This would indicate an early stage in the march of the Paulastyas towards the south. The narrative about Pulastya's marriage with Tṛṇabindu's daughter will take him to the northern plains at an early stage of his career.

One possible indication can be sought in the account of the marriage of Pulastya with the daughter of Tṛṇabindu¹⁰¹. The place where Pulastya used to perform his penances was situated in the hermitage of Tṛṇabindu so that latter's daughter, while searching for her friend, reached the place. But, a closer analysis shows that the reference is not of much direct bearing on the problem. The hermitage of Tṛṇabindu is described as situated near the Meru mountain¹⁰². Tṛṇabindu had taken to asceticism. He is referred to as a rājarṣi. Meru cannot be located¹⁰³. Moreover, it is not necessary for a king, renouncing worldly life, to establish his hermitage within his empire, though it can be expected to have been not far from it. Further, the reference says that Pulastya came to the place and settled in the hermitage for his penances. There is no indication about the place to which he originally belonged ¹⁰³a.

Another clue to the home of Pulastya can be sought in the account of the Tirthas which Pulastya narrated to Bhisma. It begins with Puskara and ends with Prayāga. Both the Tirthas receive a detailed treatment and their religious merit is sung in several verses. The glorification of these places could have been, to some extent, influenced by the association of Pulastya with these places. But, this cannot be accepted as a compelling reason. Moreover, we cannot advance any argument in favour of either of the two places as being the actual home of Pulastya. Puskara is traditionally connected with Brahmā and Pulastya is remembered as one of his mental progenies. In favour of Prayāga it may be argued that the absence of any reference to Pulastya in the Vedic literature and his recognition by the Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition will favour a place in the mid-Gaṇgā valley. But, in the absence of any definitive clue we cannot locate the original home of Pulastya in more precise terms.

6. Pulastya and Puranas

Tradition associates Pulastya closely with the composition and handing down of the Puranic texts. The *Varāhapurāṇa*¹⁰⁴ records a tradition which gives him an important role in the history of the origin and circulation of the *Purāṇasamhitā*. Brahmā learnt the *Samhitā* from the Omniscient and handed it to his son Pulastya. Subsequently it passed through Bhārgava Rāma, Ugra and Manu. According to the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* ¹⁰⁵, after Parāśara had stopped his *rākṣasa* sacrifice on the advice of his grandfather Vasiṣṭha, Pulastya blessed him to become the author of a summary of the Purāṇas. Parāśara is said to have narrated the Purāṇas as they were told to him earlier by Vasiṣṭha and Pulastya.

The association of Pulastya with the Puranas is further evidenced by the fact that he is closely connected with the transmission of the Puranic texts. Some of the Puranas are presented as an interlocution between Pulastya and another person. The Nāradīyapurānd⁰⁶ records that the Uttarabhāga of the Varāhapurāna was in the form of interlocution between Pulastya and king Kuru and dealt with the māhātmya of all the tirthas, the dharma in its entirety, and Puskara. The extant Varāhapurāna also shows that in the original form of the text Pulastya spoke on tirthas to Kururāja and the sages 107 . The extant $V\bar{a}manapur\bar{a}na$ is in the form of a narration by Pulastya to Nārada. This characteristic of the Vāmanapurāna is noticed by the Nāradīyapurāna 108. The Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa of the Padmapurāna is in the form of an interlocution between Bhisma and Pulastya. The introductory portion of the Purāṇa says that it was narrated by Brahmā to Pulastya, who, in his turn, recited it to Bhisma¹⁰⁹. As directed by Brahmā, Pulastya approached Bhisma, who was living in Gangadvara,110 and in reply to the various queries of the latter, recited the Purana to him. It was possibly due to this tradition about Pulastya that Hemādri¹¹¹ quotes long verses on different types of danas as uttered by Pulastya in the Padmapurana. Likewise, the combined testimony of the Smrticandrikā and the Jayasimhakalpadruma shows that in the Padmapurāna and the Visnudharmottara there were accounts of several vratas as expounded by Pulastya. 112

7. Pulastya and Sankhya

In the Mahābhārata the Sāntiparva mentions the name of Pulastya in a context which suggests his Sānkhya associations. Viśvavasu, the Gandharva king, approaches Yājñavalkya for the clarification of twenty-five questions. Yājñavalkya, in his reply, refers to the views of the followers of Sānkhya and Yoga. Viśvavasu, seeking further clarification about the nature of the twenty-fifth principle (pañcavimśa), the soul, refers to Yājñavalkya's profound knowledge of Sānkhya and Yoga and says that earlier he himself received instruction from many people. 113 This list contains the names of Jaigisavya, Asita, Devala, Parāśara, Vārsaganya, Bhrgu, Pañcasikha, Kapila, Suka, Gautama, Ārstisena, Garga, Nārada, Āsuri, Pulastya, Sanatkumāra, Sukra and Kaśyapa. Some of the names are known from other independent sources to have been renowned Sānkhya thinkers. Jaigişavya, Asita-Devala, Vārsaganya, Paficasikha, Kapila and Asuri played an important role in the formulation of Sānkhya principles. The inclusion of the name of Pulastya in this list is a clear proof that the tradition considered him also to have been a Sankhya thinker.

We find glaring mythological elements in this traditioin. Besides the names mentioned above, it says that later on Viśvavasu received the philosophical knowledge from Rudra, Viśvarūpa, gods, pitrs and daiteyas (demons). In the list there is a queer mixture of historical personages and legendary sages. As the names in the two categories are not clearly demarcated, we cannot be sure whether the author of the list intended Pulastya to have been a historical person. The order of the names does not respect any chronological sequence. Whereas Jaigiṣavya, Asita-Devala and Vārṣaganya are mentioned in the beginning, Pañcaśikha, Kapila and Āsuri appear later. Thus, we cannot hope to recontrust any chronological order in this list. On the basis of the list we cannot assign any date to Pulastya.

8. Pulastya in Dharmaśastra Tradition

The Dharmaśāstra tradition, as recorded in the later Smrtis and medieval Nibandha texts, preserves the memory of Pulastya as an expounder of *dharmaśāstra*. Even outside the Dharmaśāstra circles he enjoyed the reputation of an authority on Dharmaśāstra.

In the Tirthayatraparva of the Aranyakaparva of the

Mahābhārata he appears as the first to expound to Bhīsma the practice of pilgrimage as a religious creed¹¹⁴. Ariuna's departure made Yudhisthira sad. To overcome his extremely sad mood and forget Ariuna Yudhisthira wanted to go somewhere else. In advising Yudhisthira to proceed on pilgrimage, Nārada narrates to him an earlier account of Bhisma meeting Pulastya. Pulastya had introduced this religious creed as a secret practice known only to the great sages. It is more efficacious in yielding religious merit than the performance of big sacrifices. It was meant for people who could not perform the sacrificial rites. A person visiting the tirthas is required to perform certain religious acts at these places, to give gifts, or take a bath, or fast or perform a yajña. The religious merit of visiting the places and performing meritorious acts varied according to the importance of the place and the action performed. The different tirthas had varying importance. Special sanctity was attached to the performance of a particular meritorious act at a particular tirtha. A particular conjunction of various naksatras was considered specially auspicious for visiting a particular tīrtha. A person visiting a tīrtha was required to maintain a high standard of ethical conduct, to be pure in heart and to have faith.

The popularity of the *tirthas* is indicated by the fact that even a desire to visit them is said to destroy the sins of a person. The ethical side of pilgrimage is underscored when it is said that all the sins of a person are destroyed by the mere act of bath at a holy *tirtha* or by death at such a place.

The Vāmanapurāna, which is in the form of an interlocution between Pulastya and Nārada, contains passages relating to topics of dharmaśāstra. This Purāna consists mostly of ākhyānas, stotras and vratas. But, there are verses dealing with dharmaśāstra topics, for example, sinful acts leading to hell, brahmacāridharma and sadācāra, bhojya and abhojya annas, purification of objects, śauca, sadācāra for a grhastha, varṇāśramadharma, punnāma hell, twelve types of sons, taptakrcchra, the tīrthas of Kurukṣetra, Sthāṇutīrtha and the tīrthas visited by Prahlāda¹¹⁵. These topics, however, are not dealt in separate chapters, but occur in the course of some ākhyānas. None of the verses in the Pulastyasmrti can be traced in the Vāmanapurāna.

We have noticed earlier that the Srstikhanda of the

Padmapurāna is in the form of a narration by Pulastya to Bhīsma. The account of its contents recorded in the Nāradapurāṇa 116 says that beginning with creation (sṛṣṭi) it expounds the details of dharma along with various ākhyānas and itihāsa. The account makes a pointed reference to the provisions about dānas and vratas, especially the dhenudānas.

The extant text of the Srstikhanda does not differ from this summarised account. It does not aim at making provisions about the different aspects of dharma. There are narratives about srsti, the vamsas, Brahmā, Siva, Pārvatī, Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Nṛsiṃha, Vāmana, Ganeśa and Indra and some pious individuals. The provisions about different topics under dharma are emboxed in these narratives. In some cases the narratives are intended to illustrate these provisions. Besides the portions dealing with different tirthas and vratas, we have accounts of several aspects of dharma scattered throughout the text. Some topics, for example, brāhmaņalakṣaṇa 117, \bar{a} śramadharma¹¹⁸, annad \bar{a} na¹¹⁹ and śr \bar{a} ddhd²⁰ are dealt at more than one place. Some of the dharmasastra topics, which are discussed in details, are antyesti (including asaucanirnaya) and srāddha (including ābhyudayikaśrāddha, ekoddistaśrāddha, nāndiśrāddha, sapindapitrs, proper place and time for śrāddha, duty of a person failing to perform śrāddha), yugadharma, origin of varṇāśrama, āśramadharma, Brāhmanas (including the lakṣanas of a Brāhmana and an adhama Brāhmaṇa, regaining of Brāhmaṇahood, sin of torturing a Brāhmana, vrtti of a Brāhmana, his āpatkālikavrtti), dānadharma for a Sūdra, sadācāra (including serving the parents, satya, nirlobha, dayā, santosa and ahimsā), rules regarding women (including the lakṣaṇas of a pativratā, defects of a wicked woman, banning marriage with an akulina woman, sins of rajasvalāgamana and agamyāgamana, apātra vara, kanyādāna, anumarana, vidhavādharma and dāsīdāna), āhnika ācāra, pañcavidha snāna, Gangā-māhātmya, Gāyatrī-japa, jaladāna, construction of reservoirs (khātādi), planting of trees (especially Aśvattha), prapā, dharmaghāṭadāna, setubandha, constructing roads with stones, etc., gopracāra, constructing temples (devaprāsāda), donation of lamps, etc., vṛtti of a devalaka Brāhmaṇa, worship of svayambhū linga, constructing devamandapa, building house for a śrotriya, providing tatāka, ārāma, kūpa, vāpi, sarovara, etc., annadāna,

dhenudāna and śailadāna. 121

As compared with the *Vāmanapurāna*, the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa of the *Padmapurāna* covers a wider range of the dharmaśāstra topics. Some of these topics are not found in the quotations from the *Pulastyasmrti* that occur in medieval works. One can always take shelter under the explanation that passages from the relevant chapters have not been quoted in later texts. Even on points, covered by both the *Pulastyasmrti* and the *Padmapurāna*, the provisions in the latter are more detailed. This cannot be explained as a case of the richer details dropping out in course of time. A comparision of the corresponding passages in the two texts does not show any significant parallelism in regard to the terms, expressions, passages and details of the provision. The possibility of one borrowing from the other does not arise.

We can suggest that the compiler of the *Padmapurāṇa* got the idea of presenting the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa in the form of an interlocution between Bhiṣma and Pulastya from the Āraṇyakaparva of the *Mahābhārata*. The wide coverage of the dharmaśāstra topics in the *Padmapurāṇa*, as against the account of only *tirthayātrā* in the *Mahābhārata* chapters, would sugggest that by the time of the *Padmapurāṇa* the reputation of Pulastya as a Smṛti writer had been established.

We have referred 122 to passages which Hemādri quotes from the *Padmapurāna* as the utterances of Pulastya. These relate to various types of Meru (or *parvata*) *dānas* and *pañca-dhenudānas* The introductory verses, 123 quoted in connection with the *dhānya-parvatadāna* show that the original text intended to give a detailed account of various types of *dānas*. The introductory passage further indicates that the account was in the form of interlocution between Bhiṣma and Pulastya. Possibly it was believed that Pulastya, a dharmaśāstra writer, did not confine himself to *tīrthayātrā* but also expounded some other important topics, such as *dāna*, falling within the scope of dharmaśāstra.

As we have pointed out, the *Padmapurāna* has discussed *dāna* and its different types in many contexts. Chapter 21 of the *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa* deals with ten types of *dhenudāna* and ten types of *śailadāna*. The account of the *dhenudāna* and *śailadāna* in the extant *Padmapurāṇa* and the *Padmapurāṇa* quotations recorded by

Hemādri are not the same. They show difference in structure, details and expressions. One cannot be said to be a summary or revision of the other. The question is: which of the two accounts is earlier and authentic. The very fact that Hemādri gives long and full provisions about different types of *dhenu* and *śaila dānas* is a reliable ground for postulating that the *Padmapurāṇa* text, as available to him, contained these passages. It is difficult to believe that Hemādri wrote these passages and foisted them on the *Padmapurāṇa*. The possibility of Hemādri mistakingly attributing to the *Padmapurāṇa* the account occurring in another source is equally not feasible.

The shorter version found in the extant *Padmapurāṇa* seems to have been inserted in the text at a later stage and to have gained currency in course of time. But, it must be admitted that we cannot determine when, where and by whom this was done. The reasons, which prompted this exercise of substituting a shorter version for the original account, are still more difficult to determine.

It is in the light of the Padmapurāņa chapters on dharmaśāstra topics that we have to explain the passages which the Jayasimhakalpadruma quotes from the Padmapurāna on the Viśvavrata and from the Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇaon the Lakṣmi-Nārāyana-vrata and the Ghrtasnānavrata The Visnudharmottara verses on the $Ghrtasn\bar{a}navrata$ occure arlier in the Smrtic and $rik\bar{a}$. All these passages are introduced as the utterances of Pulastya 124. The passages, however, cannot be traced in the extant Padmapurāna and Visnudharmottarapurāna. But, in any case, they do confirm the prestige of Pulastya as an expounder of dharmaśāstra. Whether these passages also appeared as part of an interlocution between Bhisma and Pulastya cannot be confirmed on the basis of the available quotations. But, in any case, they suggest that as an expounder of dharmaśāstra Pulastya was credited by the tradition to have made provisions about Vratas and many important topics under Dharmaśāstra.

References

- 1. Vol. I, Pp. 516-17.
- 2. Page 4= Pulastya (our reconstruction) I . 1 . 1-2.
- 3. Page 222 = Pulastya II. 43.
- 4. Page 3.
- 5. I. 35.
- 6. S. V. Sorensen, Index of Proper Names in the Mahābhārata, s. v. Pulastya and Pulaha.
- 7. Quoted in Viramitrodaya, Paribhāṣāprakāśa,p.18.
- 8. Vāyupurāņa, 49.68-69.
- Matsyapurāna, 202. 8-13; P. L. Bhargava, India in the Vedic age, P. 188.
- 10. Mbh., III, 274, 12; I, 66, 7-9.
- 11. P. L. Bhargava, Op. cit., Pp. 167-69.
- 12. Traditions of the Seven Rsis, Delhi, 1982.
- 13. See Ram Gopal's review of the monograph in *The Indian Historical Review*, Vol. XI, Pp. 187-88.
- 14. Mbh., I. 65.10; III. 274. 12.
- 15. S. V. Sorensen, Op. cit., s. v. Pulastya.
- 16. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, Pp. 189-90.
- 17. Mbh., I. 66.4; 65. 10
- 18. Ibid., III. 272. 45; XII. 340. 18; 346. 6.
- 19. Ibid., XII. 207. 17; 208. 4; 327. 61.
- 20. Op. cit., P. 190.
- 21. Mitchiner, *Op. cit.*, (Chapters 5-7) discusses the cultic, ascetic, political and family roots of the seven *rsis* and their transference to the sky.
- 22. A. Hillebrandt, Vedic Mythology (Tr. S. Sarma), II, P.255.
- 23. X. 15. 8, 10; X. 154. 1.
- 24. III. 198.
- 25. Mbh., XII. 166. 16.
- 26. Mbh., I. 65. 10.; I. 66.4; XII. 207. 17; XII. 208. 4; Rāma, III. 14. 8.
- 27. I. 34-35.
- 28. Matsya, 171. 26-27; Bhāgavata, III. 12. 22.
- 29. Vāyu, 49. 68-69.
- 30. Matsya, III. 6-8; Vāyu 66.22; Bhāgavata, III. 12. 24.
- 31. Ch. 195.
- 32. Hopkins, *Op. cit.*, P. 41; B. Walker, *Hindu World*, II, P. 253; P. L. Bhargava, *Op. cit.*, P. 189.

- 33. II. 12 . 26-29.
- 34. I. 10.
- 35. Bhāgavata, IV. 1. 36.
- 36. Mbh., III. 258. 12.
- 37. Rāma, VII. 2. 7-34 (it does not name the tanayā of the king).
- 38. Mbh., III. 258. 12; Rāma, VII. 2. 30-35.
- 39. VII. 2.7-34.
- 40. The name of the daughter of Tṛṇabindu is not mentioned in this narrative in the $R\bar{a}m\bar{a}yana$.
- 41. Rāma, VII. 2. 30-33.
- 42. Ibid., 3.1-8.
- 43. Mbh., III. 275. 5f.
- 44. Rāma, VII. 4. 14-VII. 5. 44. Of the two Rākṣasa chiefs, Heti and Praheti, Heti married Bhayā and had a son Vidyutkeśa. Vidyutkeśa married Sālakaṭaṅkaṭā, the daughter of Sandhyā. Their son Sukeśa married Devavati, the daughter of a Gandharva named Grāmaṇi, and had three sons, Mālyavān, Sumāli and Māli, who were married respectively with Sundari, Ketumati and Vasudā, the three daughters of Narmadā, a Gandharvi. The names of the sons and daughters of these three are given. Rākā, Puṣpotkaṭā, Kaikasi and Kumbhinasi are mentioned as the daughters of Sumāli and Ketumati.
- 45. Ibid., 9.6-16.
- 46. III. 275. 5f.
- 47. VII. 9. 27-35.
- 48. P. L. Bhargava, Op. cit., P. 189.
- 49. 202. 12-13.
- 50. Rāma, VII. 3. 6-8.
- 51. Mbh., II. 7. 17.
- 52. Ibid., II. 11. 19.
- 53. Mbh., IX. 45. 9.
- 54. *Mbh.*, I. 180. 9-22.
- 55. Mbh., XII. 318. 61.
- 56. Mbh., I. 122, 52.
- 57. Mbh., III. 80. 11-29.
- 58. *Mbh.*, XII. 47. 10.
- 59. Rāma, VII. 2. 7-34.
- 60. *Ibid* VII. 90. 9.
- 61. Ibid. VII. 3, 6-8.
- 62. *Ibid*., VII. 23. Interpolated Ch.3. 56-57.
- 63. Ibid., VII. 33, 1-21.

- 64. Ibid., VII. 96. 3.
- 65. Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, P. 242.
- 66. VII. 2, 14, 23, 27.
- 67. Pargiter, Op. cit., Pp. 6-7.
- 68. Garudapurāna, I. 138. 11. Alambusā was the name of an Apsaras. It was not unusual to name women after Apsarases. Hence there was a possibility of a mistaken identification with the Apsaras, as done by Visnupurāna, IV. 1. 18 and Bhāgavatapurāna, IX. 2. 31. This possibly led the Rāmāyana to retain the name of Alambusā as the mother of Viśāla, but mention her as the wife of Iksvāku, the son of Manu Vaivasvata.
- 69. Pargiter, Op. cit., P. 147.
- 70. A Puranic tradition traces the dynasty to Dhrsta, the son of Iksvāku's brother Nabhāga. See Raychaudhuri, Political History

of Ancient India, P. 108; R. C. Majumdar and A. D. Pusalker (Ed.), The Vedic Age, Pp. 279-80. The Rāmāyana mentions Iksvāku himself as the father of Viśāla, omitting all the intervening names.

- 71. Vaiśāli, modern Basarh in Muzaffarpur, Bihar is situated on the banks of the Gandak, but the Rāmāyana locates Viśālā, founded by Viśāla, on the banks of the Gangā.
- 72. I. 47. 11-17.
- 73. Op. cit., P. 147.
- 74. Rāma. I. 47. 17-I.48.9.
- 75. Op. cit., Pp. 188-89.
- 76. *Rāma*, VII. 3. 6-8.
- 77. The account appears in one of the interpolated chapters after Rāma, VII. 23.
- 78. Rāma, VII. 33. 1.
- 79. *Ibid*., 3.
- 80. Ibid .. 20.
- 81. Pargiter, Op.cit., P. 242, f.n. 5 objects to the historicity of the narrative and points out that Kartavirya was much earlier than Trnabindu. According to him, Rāvaņa is not a personal name, it is a Sanskritized form of a Tamil word and may refer to the capture of a Dravidian king by Kārtavīrya. In support of his suggestion that Pulastya was introduced in the narrative later he points out that the Visnupurāņa (IV. 11. 6) is silent about Pulastya.
- 82. Rāma, III. 32. 23; VII. 12. 15. (Paulastya-tanaya); VII. 20. 16 (Paulastya).

- 83. Mbh.. III. 274. 13-14.
- 84. VII. 3. 11-13- एवं वर्षसहस्राणि जग्मस्तान्येकवर्षवत ।
- 85. Ibid., VII. 4-5.
- 86. Brahmāndapurāna, III. 8. 36-37; 61.10-11; Vāyupurāna, 70. 31; 86. 15.
- 87. Op. cit., P. 178.
- 88. Vāyupurāņa, 86.7.
- 89. VII. 2. 4 पुरा कृतयुगे राम प्रजापतिस्तः प्रभुः । पुलस्त्यो नाम ब्रह्मर्षिः साक्षादिव पितामहः ॥
- 90. See infra section I. 7.
- 91. A. P. Mishra, Sānkhya-darśana kā Itihāsa, Pp. 8-14.
- 92. P. L. Bhargava, Op. cit., P. 189, f.n. 1.
- Ibid., P. 242.
- 94. Rāma, VII. 3. 29; 4. 1ff, 11-13; 8. 19-24.
- 95. VII. 3. 22-36.
- 96. Mbh., III. 258. 13, 15-17.
- 97. Mbh., III. 259. 33; V. 110. 3; Rāma, III. 32. 14-16.
- 98. Rāma, VII. 8. 29; Mbh., III. 258. 16; 259. 32.
- 99. Rāma, VII. 110. 34-52; 25. 52. (Kailāśa śaila); Mbh., III. 258. 17 (Yakṣāṇāmādhipatyam); 259. 33 (Gandhamādanam).
- 100. III. 87. 2-3.
- 101. Rāma, VII. 2. 4-38.
- 102. Ibid., VII. 2. 7.
- 103. Meru is a fabulous mountain in Hindu mythology. It is "said to form the central point of Jambūdvipa; all the planets revolve round it and it is compared to the cup or seed-vessel of a lotus, the leaves of which are formed by the different Dvipas.., the river Ganges falls from heaven on its summit and flows thence to the surrounding world in four streams; the regents of the four quarters of the compass occupy the corresponding faces of the mountain, the whole of which consists of gold and gems; its summit is the residence of Brahmā and a place of meeting for the gods, Rishis, Gandharvas &c; when not regarded as a fabulous mountain, it appears to mean the highland of Tartary north of the Himālaya"-M. Monier-Williams, Sanskrit- English Dictionary's.v. Meru, p. 833, column. 2. Meru is very widely referred to in Sanskrit literature. It is described in the Mahābhārata and the Purānas. Al-Birūni tries to investigate the rational basis of the accounts of Meru given by Brahmagupta, Balabhadra and Āryabhaṭa and the Purāṇas—E. Sachau, Alberuni's India, Vol. I, Pp. 243-50. At

best we can take the reference to suggest the Himalayan region.

103a. In the Mahābhārata (XII. 47. 9) he visits Bhisma as he lies on the bed of arrows. In another passage the Pandavas, when living in the Kāmyakavana with the permission of Trnabindu, keep Draupudi in the hermitage before going for hunting-Ibid., III. 248. 5. But this is an abrupt reference; the earlier passages do not mention Trnabindu. In III. 242. 13 the Kāmyakavana is described as situated at the apex of the desert, near the Trnabindu lake. The Mahābhārata evidence will suggest that Tṛṇabindu lived near Kuruksetra, on the borders of the Rajasthan desert.

104. CXII. 64ff.

105, I. 1, 13-27.

106. I. 103. 13-14a.

107. CCXVII. 1-6.

108. I. 105. 17.

109. Padma, Srsti, 2. 47.

110. Ibid., 61-68.

111. Caturvargacintāmaņi, Pp. 346-84. Also Vidhānapārijāta Pp.139-47. See infra Appendix I.

112. See Infra Appendix II-A, B, C.

113. Mbh., XII. 318. 59-63.

114. Mbh., III. 80. 29ff. See Dhairyabala P. Vora, Evolution of Morals in the Epics, Pp. 244-46.

115. R. C. Hazra, Studies in Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, P. 179 lists Chapters 11, 12, 14, 80, and 95 as Smrti chapters.

116. I. 93.

117. Chs. 13, 15, 48.

118. Chs. 13, 15.

119. Chs. 19, 37.

120. Chs. 9-11, 52.

121. Chs. 9-11, 13, 15, 19-21, 23, 27, 28, 37, 48-55, 59-62, 64, 86.

122. See supra section I. 6.

123 See Appendix I-A, verse 1.

124. See Appendix II- A, B, C.

Chapter 2

The Pulastyasmrti: The Reconstructed Text

1. Sources

The medieval texts 1 which quote from Pulastya are: Viśvarūpa's commentary on Yājñavalkya (first quarter of the 9th century A. D.), Vijítaneśvara's Mitaksarā (A.D.1100-1120), Apararka on Yājñavalkya (c.A.D. 1125), Ballālasena's Dānasāgara (A.D. 1168-69), Devannabhatta's Smrticandrikā (c.A.D. 1150-1225), Hemādri's Caturvargacintāmani (A.D. 1260-1270), Candeśvara's Dānaratnākara (c.A.D. 1314-1324), Mādhava's Kālanirnaya (also called Kālamādhava) (A.D. 1335-1360), Laghumādhava or Kālamādhavakārikā, Nṛsimha's Prayogapārijāta (A.D. 1360-1435), Vācaspatimiśra's Tirthacintāmani (later half of the 15th century), Gadādhara's Gadādharapaddhati (Ācārasāra)(c.A.D. 1450-1500), Allādanāthasūri's Nirnayāmrta (laterthan A.D. 1250 but earlier than A.D. 1500), Raghunandana's Smrtitattva (A.D. 1510-1580), Nandapandita's Srāddhakalpalatā (A.D.1584-85), Sankarabhatta's Dharmadvaitanirnaya (c.A.D. 1580-1600), Vaidyanāthadīksita's Smrtimuktāphala (c.A.D. 1600) Rāmadaivajña's Muhūrtacintāmani (A.D.1600-1), Kamalākarabhatta's Nirnayasindhu (A.D.1612), Raghunātha Bhatta's Kālatattvavivecana (A.D. 1620), Anantabhatta's Vidhānapārijāta (A.D. 1625), Bhatta Nīlakantha's Ācāramayūkha and Prāyaściitamayūkha (A.D. 1610-1645), Mitramiśra's Viramitrodaya (first half of the 17th century), Viśvambhara Trivedin's Smrtisāroddhāra or Cakranārāyaniyanibandha (first half of the 17th century), Anantadeva's Samskārakaustubha or Samskāradidhiti (third quarter of the 17th century), Ratnākara's Jayasimhakalpadruma (A.D.1713), Gopinātha Diksita's Samskāraratnamālā (A.D.1765), Visnubhatta Athavale's Purusārthacintāmani (A.D.1784-85), Bālambhaṭṭī on Mitākṣarā (c.A.D. 1730-1820), Bapubhatta Kelakara's Srāddhamañjari

(A.D. 1810), Tryambaka Ram Oka's $\overline{A}c\overline{a}rabh\overline{u}$ sana (A.D. 1819), Trayambaka Māṭe's $\overline{A}c\overline{a}rendu$ (A.D. 1838), Dharmapradipa and Prāyaścittapradipa of Kṛṣṇamitra¹a, Kalyāpaddharmasarvasva, and Suklayajuḥśākhiya Karmakāndapradipa.

2. Survival of the text

We find that some medieval texts quote some verses not directly but from an earlier secondary source. from the Pulastyasmrti Thus, the Purusārthacintāmani quotes two verses of Pulastya2 as occurring in Hemādri and one³ in Mādhava. Likewise, the Nirnayasindhu admits taking three verses of Pulastya from three earlier writings, one each from Aparārka4 Hemādri 5 and Madanaratna. The Nrsimhiyaprayogapārijāta takes a set of two verses of Pulastya7 from Hemādri. The Acarendu also admits taking these verses from Hemādri, but in the case of one line of a as its source. The verse⁸ mentions the Acārasāra Dharmadvaitanirnaya quotes one Pulastya verse9 from Hemādri. The Suklayajuhśākhiya Karmakāndapradīpa derives three lines of Pulastya 10 from the $\overline{A}c\overline{a}ramay\overline{u}kha$. The Jayasimhakalpadrumaquotes one Pulastya verse11 from the Prthvicandrodaya. In the $\bar{A}c\bar{a}rabh\bar{u}sana$ one Pulastya line 12 is quoted from $\bar{A}c\bar{a}ras\bar{a}ra$.

Of the various texts, which quote Pulastya verses not directly from the *Pulastyasmṛti* but from some earlier secondary work, some are found strangely mentioning Pulastya as the direct source in the case of some other quotations. Thus, we find that the $\overline{A}c\overline{a}rendu$ ¹³, $\overline{A}c\overline{a}rabh\overline{u}sana$ ¹⁴ and the *Suklayajuḥśākhiya Karmakāndapradīpd*⁵ reproduce two verses, *Nirnayasindhu* eight passage, ¹⁶ *Jayasimhakalpadruma* one verse, ¹⁷ *Purusārthacintāmani* three lines ¹⁸ and *Nrsimhiyaprayogapārijāta*three verses ¹⁹ directly from Pulastya.

The *Prayogapārijāta* (A.D. 1360-1435) is among the earliest to quote Pulastya from an earlier secondary source. The secondary sources, largely drawn upon for Pulastya quotations, are Aparārka and Hemādri. Pulastya's verses are also quoted on the authority of Mādhava, the *Madanaratna*, the *Ācārasāra* (of the *Gadādharapaddhati*), the *Prthvīcandrodaya* and the *Ācāramayūkha*. Of these the *Prthvīcandrodaya* is not available presently, but is used by the *Jayasimhakalpadruma* and earlier by

Hemādri, Sankarabhaṭṭa, Kamalākarabhaṭṭa and Anantabhaṭṭa ²⁰. The *Madanaratna*, also known as the *Madanaratnapradīpa* or *Madanapradīpa*, seems to have been compiled by Viśvanātha ²¹ under the patronage of a certain king Madanasimhadeva around the date A.D. 1400-1450²²

There can be two explanations of the facts. One possibility is that a text of the *Pulastyasmrti* had come down to later times, but, some passages, which originally occurred in the text, had dropped in course of centuries, and, hence, they were reproduced only on the basis of an earlier secondary source. But, there is a serious difficulty in accepting this explanation. We find that the same verse is quoted directly from Pulastya by a few later texts, whereas some others mention an earlier secondary text as the source. ²³ This would mean that passages from the *Pulastyasmrti* have been dropping from it at intervals in different periods. It would further require us to accept the ridiculous possibility of a passage dropping at one stage to reappear in the text at a later stage.

Another more likely explanation can be that though the text in its full original form was available upto a certain period, it went out of general circulation after that. It is not unlikely that in some particular quarters a copy of the text survived for some more time, but was lost later on. The text seems to have been widely available upto the fourteenth century, and in some quarters, upto the seventeenth century, but seems not to have been in easy circulation in all areas from the fifteenth century. If the text still exists in some unknown collection, we cannot confirm its existence. The catalogues compiled so far do not list the text. We cannot rule out the possibility, howsoever remote, that a copy of this Smṛti, as in the case of some other texts, survives to be recovered as a chance discovery on some happy date later.

3. Problems of reconstruction

A serious difficulty, which a researcher, reconstructing a lost Smrti, has to face, is the absence of a standard formulation of the contents of a Smrti text. Modern authorities, such as P.V.Kane, J.R. Gharpure and K.V.R. Aiyangar, have analysed all the topics that are covered by the name Dharmaśāstra or Smrti. But, it can easily be seen that they have taken into account the wide scope of the terms as

they developed in course of centuries and as they came to be accepted by Nibandha writers. We do not have a single original Smrti planned according to the requirements of the full scope and contents of Dharmaśāstra. The ancient Smrtis, under the names of Manu, Yājnavalkya, Nārada and Parāśara, do not conform to this listing of topics. They show wide variation in the choice of topics, the emphasis given to them, and the order in which they are presented.

The situation is illustrated best by the minor Smrtis. They do not exhaust all the topics falling under the scope of Dharmaśāstra. Some of them totally ignore some impotant parts of the socio-religious system associated with the Dharmaśāstras. In some cases we find them confining themselves to one or some of these topics.

We can get an idea of the nature and dimensions of the problem when we analyse the reconstruction of the Smṛtis attempted so far. Whereas in the case of the earlier Smṛtis, Bṛhaspati²⁴ and Kātyāyana,²⁵ the treatment seems to have been detailed and exhaustive in covering the topics, the surviving passages do not indicate a parallel situation in the case of other Smṛtis, such as that of Vyāsa.²⁶

Our reconstruction has naturally to be conditioned by the availability of the passages which have survived. Later writers naturally quoted passages relevant to the topics on which they wanted to lay down provisions. No doubt, with a view to making their discussion exhaustive, they noted diverse views on any point; but, they cannot be criticised for a natural tendency to give more space to passages which were in support of their own views. Likewise, if they preferred to quote better known and more important authorities and did not reproduce passages from all the lesser known and minor Smṛtis, it was a choice dictated by the demands of limited space. In selecting quotations from any Smṛti they cared for those passages which seemed to represent their significant views and were without much parallel in other Smṛtis.

The available quotations can at best reveal only a small fraction of the icaberg of any Smṛti. The Nibandha writers were under no obligation to indicate the outlines of the structure of the Smṛtis drawn upon. They did not quote uniformly from all the chapters of a Smṛti. It is quite likely that in the process they omitted completely its many chapters. Even in the case of chapters, from which they have actually

quoted, they were not required to reproduce representative passages to indicate the contents. They selected only quotable quotes.

Thus, in the existing situation we cannot expect to get indications of all the chapters of a Smrti. It is quite likely that some chapters will always remain unknown to us. In the case of the chapters represented by the quotations we get an idea of their total content only when the entire chapter has been reproduced.

The surviving quotations in the present case do not help us in reconstructing the structure of the original Smṛti. They reproduce the passages without indicating their association with the chapters in the *Pulastyasmṛti*. It must be emphasised that the occurrence of a particular passage in a discussion about any topic in the Nibandha texts or commentaries is not always a safe indication that in the original *Pulastyasmṛti* also it appeared in the same context. A particular passage in the *Pulastyasmṛti* has been quoted by later texts in several contexts to indicate or corroborate certain provisions²⁷. It is the relevance of that passage to the details of any one or many topics, as discussed in the later Dharmaśāstra writings, that made their authors reproduce the passage. A careful analysis of the passage and its comparision and correlation with other passages do indicate the context in which it occurred in the original text.

The quotations do not mention the headings of the different chapters. Some of the medieval sources do contain a reference to the context in which the passage occurred. They point out the topic discussed in the original Smrti from which the quotation is taken ²⁸. But, it can be seen, in some cases at least, that the passage could not possibly have formed part of a chapter dealing with that topic ²⁹. The medieval writers mention the topic for which they are using the testimony of the passage quoted by them and thus indicate the point for which they consider the passage to be relevant.

In some of the extant minor Smrtis we find that a full chapter has been devoted to a point which seems to be of minor significance among the topics that are covered by Dharmaśāstra. This could have been on account of the interest of its author in that particular topic. The topic possibly had assumed a greater importance in his times. This special significance could have resulted from the relevance of the topic for the region or socio-religious group to which the author belonged.

One extract from the *Pulastyasmrti* ³⁰ begins with the introductory sentence: Athātaḥ kṛṣṇājinadānavidhiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ. This is exactly the formula adopted in many Smṛtis at the beginning of a chapter. This would suggest that the *Pulastyasmrti* contained a separate chapter entitled *Kṛṣṇājinadāna*. On this analogy we can speculate that some other chapters also had a parallel introductory sentence. But, in the absence of actual sentences in other cases we cannot speculate a uniform applicability of this style to all the chapters of the original Smṛti. We find that some other Smṛtis have such introductory sentences only in some of their chapters and not in all.

We do not know the style of presentation adopted by the author, how a topic was introduced, how it was classified into sub-points, and the extent to which its various aspects were covered. It is only in the case of the chapter on Krsnājinadāna that we have the whole of it quoted. The passage mentions the occasion for making the gift and the specific nature of the black deer's skin to be gifted. It gives full details of the procedure. The ground is to be smeared with cowdung. Kuśa grass is to be spread over it and then it is to be covered with a woollen cloth. The deer's skin is to be placed on it. Its full form is to be reconstructed by placing sesamum on it and it is to be covered with two pieces of cloth. On the four sides four pots of copper, silver, bronze and gold are to be placed with Ksira in the eastern pot, curd in the southern one, ghee in the western one, and honey in the northern one. On each side a cow, which has calved for the first time, is to be placed. On the western side fire is to be ignited to the accompaniment of mahāvyāhrtis, and sesamum soaked in ghee is to be offered. A learned Brāhmana, covered with two pieces of cloth and bedecked with ornaments, is to be given the deer's skin. The sentence, which the donor is to utter at the time of making the gift, and the replying sentence, which the donor is to utter while receiving it, are also mentioned. Verses or passages, eulogising the merit of the gift, are not recorded. We do not know if they were omitted by Hemādri. Possibly they did not occur in the original Smrti itself. As indicated by the introductory sentence, the scope of the 'chapter was limited to the details of the procedure (vidhi) of the $d\bar{a}na$. It may be surmised that, if there were some other chapters of a parallel nature, the author adopted a similar style of presentation for them.

In the Pulastyasmrti III. 1 the last word in the second line is $dvijottam\bar{a}h$. J. R. Gharpure ³¹ takes the reading to be dvijottama and translates it as "O best of the twice-born". If the expression is treated as being in the vocative case, then it will have an important bearing on the form and structure of the original Pulastyasmrti. It would imply that the text was in the form of an interlocution in which the main speaker, possibly Pulastya himself, addressed his ordinances to a person, who was most likely a Brāhmaṇa. But, there is no need for taking the expression to be in the vocative case. No doubt, the first line has grhi in the nominative case, but that does not prevent another word in the second line also being in that case. In Sanskrit literature it is quite fashionable to have the noun in the nominative case in one line and to retain its qualifying word in the nominative case in the second line.

4. Nature of the text : Dharmaśāstra or Smrti

Before attempting a reconstruction of the text, associated with the name of Pulastya, we have to decide its nature, whether it was a Dharmasūtra or a Smṛti. Kane ³² has noted a prose passage from Pulastya which deals with the procedure about the gift of black deer's skin (kṛṣṇājinavidhi). This passage occurs in the Dānaratnākarð of Caṇḍeśvara. The section on the gift of black deer's skin was considered to be a significant one in the text ascribed to Pulastya. The Dānasāgara³⁴ of Ballālasena quotes an aphorism from this very section in Pulastya's text. Hemādri, in his Caturvargacintāmant³⁵, reproduces the full section, which contains both these passages. Another prose quotation from Pulastya is again an aphorism about the performance of Sandhyā in the Gaṅga and occurs in the Tīrthacintāmani³⁶.

The prose passages do not seem to have a stray existence in the original text composed by Pulastya. The introductory line in the quotation, recorded in the *Dānaratnākara* and the Dānakhaṇḍa of the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* makes it clear that there was possibly a full chapter (or at least a specific section of a chapter) on the procedure for making a gift of black deer's skin, which was not in verses. The full quotation in the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* shows that

32

the text did not contain succint $s\bar{u}tras$ in the style of the Dharmas $\bar{u}tras$. The prose passages contained the full account with all the details of the procedure of the $d\bar{a}na$ spelt out. If we postulate a similar treatment of some other topics, prose passages will seem to have occupied considerable space in the text named after Pulastya.

Here a natural question arises: did all these passages, prose and verses alike, form part of one single text? A possible explanation can be that there were two texts under the name of Pulastya: a Dharmasūtra and a Smrti. We find that the Prayogapārijāta³⁷ mentions Pulastya twice, once as an author of an upasmrti and a second time as one of the other $smrtikart\bar{a}s$. This would seem to support the suggestion of two different types of texts authored by Pulastya. Behind this suggestion is the tacit assumption that the Dharmasūtras, as contrasted with the Smrtis, are mostly in the form of sūtras or prose aphorisms. Those, who would be inclined to support the suggestion of the composition of both a Dharmasūtra and a Smrti by Pulastya, will explain the use of the term Smrti for the two texts of Pulastya in the Prayogapārijāta by pointing that in listing the Dharmaśāstra authors the Prayogapārijāta does not discriminate between a Smrti and a Dharmasūtra and uses the name Smrti alike for both the types of texts.

But, the assumption of a difference between a Dharmasūtra and a Smṛti text, on the ground of the use of prose in the first and verses in the second, is a misleading argument. The Smṛti texts are also found to contain prose passages, and the Dharmasūtras, likewise, contain verses. Moreover, there is no independent testimony for a Dharmasūtra composed by Pulastya. It is to be noted that S. C. Banerji 38, who compiles a list of Dharmasūtra writers, known only through their quotations in later texts, and collects such prose passages, does not include Pulastya in his list. Either he did not notice the prose passages attributed to Pulastya, or else he rejected the possibility of a *Pulastya Dharmasūtra*.

The testimony of the *Prayogapārijāta* does not necessarily imply the existence of two texts composed by Pulastya. We have pointed out in a later context ³⁹ that Angiras and the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* seem to commit the mistake of prefixing to their list of Upasmṛtis a verse of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya naming ten Dharmaśāstra writers and thus listing the name Pulastya twice. It

seems likely that there was only one 'Pulastyasmṛti, of which all the quotations, including prose passages, formed part. It is to be noted that, though a large majority of the Smṛtis are in verses, there are some which are in mixed prose and verses, whereas a few are entirely in prose 10. There is, thus, no inherent contradiction in attributing both the prose passages and the verses to one and the same Pulastyasmṛti.

5. Two works of Pulastya '

We do not want to dismiss the possibility of the repetition of some names of Dharm'aśāstra writers in the two lists in the *Prayogapārijāta* being a deliberate effort to record the actual facts. Angiras and the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* may have tapped a verse of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya for completing their list of Upasmṛtis associated with the names of all those authors who are listed here, including those whose names occur in the other lists in *Prayogapārijāta*.

We have seen later on 41 that the *Pulastyasmrti* was not among the earlier Smrtis and that Pulastya received recognition as a Dharmaśāstra writer first from Vrddha-Yājflavalkya. As Pulastya was not one of the important Smrti writers, the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* included him in his third list of other smrtikartās. Subsequently another small Smrti was composed for which also the name of Pulastya was adopted as its author. It was not a voluminous text. It did not cover many topics falling under the scope of Dharmaśāstra. On account of its limited scope and the limited number of verses in it, it was aptly described as an Upasmrti by Angiras and the author of the *Prayogapārijāta*

The available material associated with the name of Pulastya suits the above suggestion. We have a small Smrti, containing twenty-nine verses, which has been published as *Pulastyasmrti*. There does not seem to be any connection between this published Smrti and the other Smrti authored by Pulastya, from which quotations are recorded in medieval works. The published *Pulastyasmrti* answers the requirements of the Upasmrti of Pulastya. The Dharmaśāstra writer mentioned by Vrddha-Yājñavalkya and included in the list of other smrtikrtās in the *Prayogapārijāta* will then be the author of the *Pulastyasmrti* from which we have received quotations.

6. Reconstruction of the text: its contents

The available extracts do not indicate the scheme of chapterisation adopted in the original Smrti. We have grouped the verses into chapters, some of which have been further divided into sections.

We do not claim any finality for the headings of chapters and sections suggested by us. They are not mentioned in the extracts. The only exception is the heading *Kṛṣṇājindāna* for chapter V.

We have grouped the extracts under eleven chapters. The first chapter is introductory in nature. We have named it as *Dharmanirūpaṇam*. It possibly discussed such general problems as the meaning of the term Dharma, the nature and scope of the Dharmaśāstras, the ultimate aim of life, and the means for realising it. We have tentatively divided the chapter into two sections - *Dharmanūlam* and *Jīānakarmasamāyoga*. The first describes *Kalpasūtra* as dealing with Srauta-karma. It refers to similar codes of Gṛḥya rites. It seems that in the second section there was some discussion about conflicting provisions in different Smṛtis. The text advises that there should be a proper synthesis between *jīāna* (knowledge) and *karma* (action).

The second chapter has been named $\overline{A}hnik\bar{a}c\bar{a}ra$; it deals with the daily routine of duties. It consists of several sections, of which we have listed six here.

The first section provides for the method of taking bath (snāna). It praises bath in a river as of special merit. Of the rivers the Gangā is eulogised for removing sin. Greater merit attaches to bath in a river in the vicinity of a Sivalinga. On the Puṣya, on one's birth constellation, on the Vyatipāta or the Vaidhṛti, as also on the Amāvasyā a river bath consecrates the family for seven generations. Those, who take a bath on a Sunday, Tuesday and Saturday, are never affected by ailments. On the fourteenth day of the dark half of Caitra, he who bathes in the vicinity of the God Siva, in the Gangā in particular, never dies.

The second section deals with dress to be put on (vastradhāraṇa) after the bath. In this connection it defines ahata (unspoiled cloth), the garment pure for use for all rites, as slightly blown, new, white, with ends on and as that which has not been put

on.

The third section relates to *tripundra* or the application of forchead marks with sanctified ashes and mentions the religious ment resulting from the use of different *mantras*.

The rules about $sandhy\bar{a}$ are placed in the fourth section. Though full details have not survived, we have indications that there were lengthy provisions. One of the surviving passages provides that $sandhy\bar{a}$, isii, caru and homa are to be performed throughout the life and are not to be given up even in the case of impurity caused by death $(s\bar{u}taka)$; one abandoning them goes to degradation. One should recite the mantras mentally without doing $pr\bar{a}n\bar{a}y\bar{a}ma$. Another extract requires a person to recite the $sandhy\bar{a}$ mantra a lac times.

The fifth section deals with rules about taking meals (bhojana). One should eat with a concentrated mind, taking sweet in the beginning, saltish and acid in the middle, and stringent, bitter, etc. in the end. One should take one's meals leaving a remnant, excepting the curds, barley food, clarified butter, meat, milk, honey and water. After finishing one's meal one should sip water and, in the name of those entitled to a share in the remnant of food, drop, along with water, a part of all the items of food. On the occasion of a parva there should be no fasting, nor eating in the evening; one should take one small meal in the form of sacrificial food devoid of oil and meat. One should not eat on the ekādaśī day and a woman should not eat during menses. One should hold a drinking pot with one's right hand and not with the left one.

The sixth section lists twelve intoxicating drinks $(mady\bar{a}ni)$, of which $sur\bar{a}$ is the worst. It says that on drinking the fresh juice of $dr\bar{a}k\bar{s}\bar{a}$ (grapes), $ik\bar{s}u$ (sugarcane), tanka (wood-apple) $khaj\bar{u}ra$ (date) and panasa (jack fruit) one is purified after three days.

The third chapter relates to the worship of god $(devap\bar{u}j\bar{a})$. It requires all the objects used in the worship to be sprinkled and water to be sipped before starting any performance or holy rite. The abrupt beginning of the quotation, implied by the use of the pronoun *tena* (by that), shows that the preceding verses have not been recorded. The introductory remark (\bar{a} camanānantaram) in the Caturvargacintāmani 42 would suggest that there were verses providing for purificatory sipping of water. The passage lists the trees which are

to be avoided in making wooden seats (pitha) for use in rites concerning ancestors and gods. After getting up in the morning one should be purified and submit to lord Visnu " I shall be doing all the work as directed by you ". After offering prayers one should awaken Visnu with musical instruments. In several verses we have different names of Visnu which are to be recited (japet) for different objectives: fulfilment of desire, achieving victory, studies, release from bondage, cure of eye trouble, freedom from fear, use of medicine, proceeding to the battle-field, living in another place, in legal disputes, in sneezing or stumbling, when afflicted by asterism and planets, or divine obstacles, when hindered by robbers and enemies, when facing lions and tigers, when engulfed in darkness, when suffering from fever, for removing the effect of snake's poison, when storing wealth and grains, in case of bad dreams, for prosperity, for getting a progeny, in case of bad omens, fear of death through storm, fire, water or chain. Whatever desire may arise, one should think of Him in all matters. One secures the accomplishment of all desires by remembering these names, as they have one and the same import, whether they are the names of one Supreme Brahma or not.

The fourth chapter deals with religious gifts (dāna). The surviving verses relate to the offering of gifts on special occasions such as ayana (solstice), visuva (equinox), viṣṇupadi, ⁴³ sankrāntt⁴ and eclipse. On the occasion of the eclipse of the Sun by Rāhu one should, after touching the water of a nearby tirtha, with a view to desiring fruits from charity, commence a satra donation. If a rite is performed at an improper time, it should be performed again when the proper time is reached. A rite, which is performed after the proper time has passed is to be regarded as not done.

It seems that there were separate chapters dealing with special types of dānas. The Dharmaśāstra tradition preserves a rich literature on dāna in the Nibandhas. They relate to various types of special dānas: tulāpuruṣadānas, mahādānasand parvatadānas. We can never be sure about the special dānas covered by our Smṛti. The provisions appeared in texts, some of which, on account of their greater respectability, became the natural sources for being quoted by later texts. This may explain the absence of quotations from the relevant chapters in our text.

In view of the merit associated with it, the method of giving the gift of the skin of a black deer was described in a chapter, which, in our reconstruction, is numbered as the fifth chapter. In the month of Karttika on the full moon day, or in Vaiśakha on the occasion of lunar or solar eclipse, equinox or solstice the skin of a black deer, with hoofs and horns intact, without any wounds, and pleasing to look at, is to be given to a Brahmana.

We do not have quotations from other chapters in the text which dealt with special types of dānas. But, the Caturvargacintāmani in the Dānakhaṇḍa⁴⁵ quotes in full the provisions about some of these dānas occurring in the Padmapurāṇa as the utterances of Pulastya. They begin with the expression Pulastya uvāca and end with Iti Padmapurāṇoktaḥ parvata (or acala) dānavidhiḥ. They relate to dhānyaparvatadāna, lavaṇācaladāna, guḍācaladāna, suvarṇācaladāna, rūpyācaladāna and śarkarācaladāna. The Vidhānapārijāta⁴⁶ also reproduces these provisions (as utterances of Pulastya in the Padmapurāṇa) on the dānas of guḍācala, suvarṇācala,tilācala, ratnācalaraupyācala and śarkarācala. The introductory verse in all these cases has the set formula of Athātaḥ saṃpravakṣyāmi. Only in the case of suvarṇācaladāna we have a slightly different phrase Atha pāpaharanvakṣye.

These passages are not to be found in the available text of the Padmapurāna. Instead we find them in the Visnupurana 47 but as utterances of Isvara and not of Pulastya. It is interesting to note that one manuscript of the Danoddyota*8 section of the Madanaratnapradipa quotes the verses on suvarnācaladāna. tilācaladāna and ratnācaladāna as being from the Padmapurāna. All this would make a case that earlier the Padmapurāna or its manuscripts in certain regions contained provisions about several types of parvatadanas49, but, in course of time, they tended to be dropped out . In view of the specific references in the Caturvargacintāmani, supported by two other texts, we cannot say that the attribution of these passages to the Padmapurana was the result of a confusion in certain circles. We must note that Hemādri quotes Brahmāndapurāna, Bhavisyottarapurāna and Visnudharmottarapurāna on these dānas. This also confirms the attribution. We find that the readings in the Caturvargacintāmani are generally to be found in the Matsyapurāna as well, whereas the Vidhānapārijāta

shows some variations. It is not unlikely that the two Purāṇas (*Padma* and *Matsya*) drew upon the same common source.

The verses introducing the account about the dhānyaparvatadāna in the Caturvargacintāmani 50 indicates that Bhisma asked Pulastya to instruct him about the religious merit of dāna in general (dānamāhātmyam). In his reply Pulastya proposed to describe the merudana of ten types, which is the same as parvatadāna or acaladāna of other texts. He lays down general rules governing such danas and then goes on to record special provisions about other types of acaladanas. All these seem to have formed part of a big chapter on danas. This is confirmed by another long passage in the same text 51 giving rules about pañcadhenudāna intended as an utterance of Pulastya in the Padmapurāna. We can infer that according to Hemādri the Padmapurāna had several chapters as utterances of Pulasyta and describing different types of dānas: parvatadānas, mahādānas, dhenudānas and tulāpurusadānas.

The section of dana in the Padmapurana as recorded in the Caturvargacintāmani began with an account of merudāna 52. On the request of Bhisma Pulastya proposes to describe⁵³ the ten types of merudanas in the form of parvatas of dhanya, lavana, guda, hema, tila, karpāsa, ghrta, ratna, rajata and śarkarā. He goes on to lay down general provisions governing these danas followed by specific details about the dhānyaparvatadāna. We do not have here the introductory sentence parallel to those for other parvatadānas Athātah sampravaksyāmi. At the end of the provision we do not get the concluding expression iti Padmapurānoktahdānavidhih. This is possibly because this chapter served as an introductory one for the whole section. We have noted above the chapters dealing with eight other parvatadānas. The Caturvargacintāmani quotes from the Padmapurāna the provisions about karpāsaparvatadānā. But, here we do not have either the expression Pulastva uvāca or the introductory sentence or the concluding expression. But, comparing it with other chapters we can suggest that this also was a part of the fuller account. It is like the chapter on tiladanavidhanam in being introduced by the expression Padmapurānāt and in omitting the concluding expression. The chapter on tiladanavidhanam, like all other chapters, has the expression Pulastya uvāca which would

seem to have been inadvertently dropped in the case of the quotation of the chapter on *karpāsaparvatadāna*.

It seems that the *Padmapurāna* also contained accounts of some *vratas* as described by Pulastya. The *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* contains one such quotation on Viśvavrata (Appendix II-A) which, however, cannot be traced in the available text of the *Padmapurāṇa*. The *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* records two more passage as utterances of Pulastya reported as occurring in the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*. One of these provides details about the Lakṣmi-Nārāyaṇa-vrata (Appendix II-B), whereas the other concerns Ghṛtasnānavrata (Appendix II-C). That this was not a mistake on the part of the author of the *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* is indicated by the fact that the *Smrticandrikā*, one of the early Nibandha texts, also quotes from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* the utterances of Pulastya. These possibly relate to the Ghṛtasnānavrata, as they include one of the two verses on the topic quoted by the *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma*. But, none of these passages occur in the available text of the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*.

The Tirthayātrāparva section in the Āraṇyakaparva of the Mahābhārata contains the views of Pulastya on tīrthas andtīrthayātra⁵⁵. The context is provided by the departure of Ārjuna which makes the Pāṇḍavas sad and deeply dejected. Nārada appears and, to the enquiry made by Yudhiṣṭhira about the merit of pilgrimage, refers to the interlocution between Bhīṣma and Pulastya. Bhīṣma earlier sought from Pulastya enlightenment about the efficacy of going on pilgrimage. The reply given by Pulastya extends from Mbh. III. 80.29 to Mbh. III. 83.95.

In the introductory verses Pulastya refers to the cult of pilgrimage as practised by the sages. It was a secret practice known to the sages. The merit of pilgrimage is enjoyed by a person who has control over his limbs and mind, who has the necessary moral qualities, and is free from all the vices. Pulastya eulogises it as better than the cult of sacrifices. Sacrifices entail much expenditure and cannot be performed by a poor man. The religious merit accruing from pilgrimage cannot be received even by performing agnistoma and other sacrifices.

Pulastya describes various *tīrthas* in different parts of the country. These include places, forests, *āśramas*, mountains, rivers, their confluences with other rivers and seas, and lakes and

reservoirs. The account refers to the specific religious acts to be performed at the *tirthas*. Taking bath, observing fast and giving *dānas* are the important items. In all cases the religious merit accruing from the pilgrimage is mentioned.

Concluding his account Pulastya says that this is the truth for the twice-born and pious people and is to be recited in the ears of one's progenies, dear ones, students and followers. It is meritorious, pious and bestower of happiness and leads to heaven. This secret practice of the great sages removes all the sins. By reading it one becomes pure. Hearing this account of the *tirthas* is also meritorious. One should visit mentally the *tirthas* which are difficult to reach.

It is clear from the account in the *Mahābhārata* that traditionally Pulastya was considered to be the foremost champion of pilgrimage. Whether this account of the cult of pilgrimage and the description of the various *tīrthas* was derived from some text composed by him cannot be confirmed.

In the surviving quotations of the *Pulastyasmrti* we have references to the *tirthas* and eulogy of the Gangā. We cannot trace parallels in expressions and passages, but there is some similarity in the general view on these points. We cannot establish that in the Smrti text there was a separate chapter on *tirthas*. Thus, the relevant chapters in the *Mahābhārata* are useful in indicating the views of Pulastya, whose name is associated with a Smrti, which also seems to have attached great importance to *tirthas*, but we cannot maintain that similar accounts occurred in the original *Pulastyasmrti*. ⁵⁶.

Chapter VI deals with purification (śuddhivicāra). Here also the surviving verses indicate that the original chapter was a long one. One verse says that one going to the road or market is not purified by sipping water, if he does not wash his feet. The second verse indicates that there were detailed provisions about purification for a householder..

Chapter VII deals with rites of purification when one is bitten by animals, particularly dogs (paśudaṣṭe śuddhiḥ). There are special provisions if the victim is doing a vrata, is bitten in a village devoid of Brāhmaṇas, is a Brāhmaṇa woman, is a snātaka, or is a woman in menses. If the person is bitten above the navel, the purificatory penances are double, if in the mouth three times, and if in the head

four times.

The rites for purification in case of talking with a pāṣaṇḍī (heretic) (pāṣandisamsarge śuddhih), are detailed in chapter VIII. A pāṣandī is described as a person who has violated the duties of his varna and āśrama as ordained in the Vedas and Smrtis, behaves according to his will following false reasoning, resorts to evil deeds, possesses an evil character, and indulges in hypocritic rites. In later verses the pāṣandins are described as eulogising evil food, eating unpurified food, devoid of sacraments, conceited, intermixing the varnas, earning their living through false religion, performing austerities without purification, atheists, fallen from the noble path ordained in the Vedas, and denouncing the rites prescribed in Rk, Yajus and Sāman. Later they are further described as denouncing Vedic rites, without faith in Vedic rites, and as having the thoughts of a devil. On account of delusion their sense of righteous conduct is destroyed; they give up the duties of their varna; impelled by false knowledge they commit sin under a sense of dharma; their knowledge is destroyed; they give replies which involve false reasoning; they apply themselves and others in evil deeds and fall from their dharma. For purification one has to meditate upon Visnu under the name of Acyuta and has to offer faithful prayers. In case of seeing, talking to, or touching the pasandins one has to take bath.

In chapter IX on expiation (*prāyaścitta*) the details of the provisions in different cases for sin have not been recorded. A woman, an old man or a sick person is to do half of the expiations, whereas a child is to do only one-fourth of it. A man who has not undergone sacraments, who cannot exert, is sick and is in his nineties ⁵⁷ is to perform expiation according to his capacity, because in such a case the *vrata* is not lost.

Chapter X dealing with funeral rites (śrāddha) seems to have been among the long chapters. The surviving verses can be classified into eight sections. The first section relates to the rules about cremation (antyeṣṭi). If the rites of the father, who died earlier, have not been performed and the mother dies subsequently, her cremation and other rites are to be done along with her husband and the two are to be cremated on the same pyre from the aupasana fire. The second section concerns provisions about impurities resulting from death (sūtaka). There is no such impurity in water, cowpen, tīrthas, on

parvas and seeing Rāhu. There is immediate purification, if the deceased damsel is young in age; after a day, if she is grown up; after three days, if she is betrothed, and after a fortnight, if she is offered in marriage. In the third section on oblations (tarpana) it is laid down that when offering oblations one should bend his knee a little. In offering to the gods one should sprinkle the right knee with the kuśas having their foreparts pointing to the east; in offering to the ancestors one should sprinkle the left knee and use twofold kuśas. After offering oblations one should come out of the water and should squeeze his lower garment on the bank. The fourth section requires that the ekoddista śrāddha (funeral rites for one particular individual) is not to be performed before the sapindana of the parents, after which it is resumed. In the fifth section it is provided that sapindikarana (the performance of srāddha) for a kinsman, entitled to the same funeral rice-ball offering as of one's father and mother, is to be done after the samvatsara is over, but without the use of fire. The sixth section provides that the ten types of sons are to perform the śrāddha every year, those other than the aurasa are to do it without fire; the pārvana (common funeral rites performed on the parva) is to be done without fire. If the period of the parva and the day of death coincide or if one dies on the new moon day or pretapakṣa, then the pārvaṇaśrāddha is to be done, but never the ekoddista. If the father dies during pretapaksa, the pārvana is to be done. For a person having first cousins the ekoddista is to be done.

Section seven concerns the objects to to be offered as gifts on the occasion of funeral rites (śrāddhadāna). Śrāddha is defined as the purified and nice food made of milk, curd and ghee which is offered with reverence (śraddhayā). The food to be offered for a Brāhmaṇa is the food taken by ascetics, meat for a Kṣatriya and a Vaiśya, and honey for a Śūdra, and for all what is not repugnant to them. In śrāddha one is to avoid meat which is not consecrated by sprinkling (aprokṣita), which is not produced by the king (rājānutpādita) and which is killed by a hunter. It lists seven trees from which seat (pīṭha) to be offered to the ancestors is to be made. It provides that on the two ayana (solstice) days, the two viṣuvat (equinoxe) days on any Saṅkrānti, on Ekādaśi and Trayodaśi and during Bharaṇi, Maghā and Kṛttikā pindas are not to be offered. It

provides for separate śrāddha to be offered on mahālaya day, funeral rites in Gayā and on the day of the death.

The eighth section possibly provided for the people who could perform the śrāddha. In one verse mātāmahas are defined as three generations of grandfathers beginning with the father of one's mother. For them the daughter's son should perform śrāddha as for the father (mātāmahaśrāddha).

Pulastya made special provisions for the funeral rites of ascetics (saṃnyastānām śrāddhavidhānam) separately in chapter XI. Among the ascetics he mentions the kuticaka, bāhūdaka, hamsa, paramahamsa, ekadandi, tridandi, and manodandi. The kuticaka is to be cremated, bahūda is to be buried, hamsa is to be thrown in the water and paramahamsa is to exposed for being torn to pieces58. Sapindikarana is not to be done for them. On the eleventh day the pārvana śrāddha is to be done. The son should perform the pindayajña, the darśa śrāddha upon the day of death. For a vati the pārvana shall be upon a mahālayā or a darśa or upon his death anniversary; for others it shall be the ekoddista. In the case of their dead bodies there is no impurity. One who carries the dead body receives the merit of an Aśvamedha at each step. With faith in Visnu one should take bath and go home. If he takes bath thinking of impurity, he is subjected to the punishment of the sugarcane mill 59. The provisions are made applicable to the ekadandi and tridandi ascetics. It is further provided that the pārvaņa śrāddha is to be performed by the aurasa son of the ascetic.

References

- We have followed the dates of all these texts generally as given by Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol.I, Parts I &II.
- 1a. Neither Kane nor the editor of the Pradipatraya gives his date.
- 2. I.1.3: X.5.1.
- 3. II.5.5.
- 4. II.4.12.
- 5. X.7.2.
- 6. X.5.1.
- 7. I.1.1-2.
- 8. X.3.1.
- 9. X.5.1.
- 10. II.3.1-2a.
- 11. II.1.6.
- 12. X.3.1.
- 13. II.1.4; I.1.1-2; II.5.2.
- 14. II.5.2;II.4.1; II.1.9.
- 15. II.5.1:X.7.8.
- 16. II.1.6; II.5.5; X.2.2; X.7.2, 4, 6, 8; X.8.1.
- 17. X.7.6.
- 18. X.7.5a-6.
- 19. II.4.1-2; IV.4.
- 20. Kane, Op. cit., p. 1066.
- 21. Assisted by Ratnākara, Gopinātha and Gangādharabhatta. See Kane, Op.cit., Pp.806-7.
- 22. Kane, Op.cit., Pp. 808-9.
- 23. I.1.1-2,3; II.1.6; II.4.1.2; II.5.5; X. 3.1; X.5.1; X.7.2.
- 24. K.V.Rangaswami Aiyangar, Brhaspatismrti (Reconstructed) (Gaekwad Oriental Series LXXXV) Baroda, 1941.
- 25. P.V.Kane, Kātyāyanasmrtisāroddhāra(Hindu Law Quarterly, Bombay), Reprinted Poona, 1933.
- 26. B.K. Ghosh, Vyāsasmrti (Indian Culture, Vol.IX, Pp.65-98).
- 27. II.4.1-2 (Vidhānapārijāta and Srāddhakdpalatā); IV.2.3 (Muhūrtacintāmani); X.7.6 (Smrtisāroddhāra, Nirnayāmrta, Smrtimuktāphala, Purusārthacintāmaņi, Viramitrodaya Samayaprakāśa, Caturvargacintāmaņi).
- 28. Prāyaścittapradipa (in Pradipatraya), P.22; Ācārabhūṣaṇa, P.22.
- 29. Pulastya I.6.1-2; Prāyaścittapradipa (in Pradipatraya), P.22 in connection with Abhaksyaprāyaścitta; Viramitrodaya, Śuddhi, P.137 in connection with Dehādiśuddhinirūpana.

- 30. Pulastva, Ch.V.
- 31. Smrticandrikā, Translation.
- 32. Op. cit., P. 517, f.n. 609.
- 33. Folio 51a (= Pulastya V.1-2 upto manoharam only) as quoted by Kane, Op. cit.
- 34. Page 48- तथा कृष्णाजिनदाने पुलस्त्यः सर्वगुणविशिष्टं ददानी (मी) ति।
- 35. Dānakhanda, Pp.703-5.
- 36. Page 222- गङ्गाया शतसाहस्री।
- 37. Quoted in Viramitrodaya, Paribhäṣāprakāśa, P.18.
- 38. Dharmasūtras: A Study in their origin and development.
- 39. See infra section III. A. 2.
- 40. Kane, Op. cit., Vol.I, P.304.
- 41. See infra Section III.A. 2.
- 42. Śrāddhakalpa, Part I, P.402.
- 43. The Sun's passage into the zodiacal signs of Vṛṣa, Simha, Vṛścika and Kumbha-Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary s.v.Visnupadi.
- 44. Passage of the Sun or a planet from one sign or position in the heavens into another-Monier-Williams, Loc, cit., s.v. sankrānti.
- 45. Pages 346-84. We reproduce them as Appendix I-A.
- 46. Pages 139-47. The introductory phrase is Padme Pulastya uvāca.
- 47. Chapters 84-92.
- 48. Vol. II, Pp.302, 304, 309. It attributes (*Ibid.*, P. 306) the verses on Karpāsācaladāna also to the Padmapurāna. Another manuscript mentions only the verses on suvarnācaladāna as occurring in the Padmapurāna.
- 49. The Vidhānapārijāta does not reproduce similar provisions about dhānyācaladāna, lavanācaladāna, karpāsācaladāna, ghrtācaladāna and sikharadāna.
- 50. Dānakhanda, p. 346.
- 51. Ibid., Pp.406-7. See Appendix I-B.
- 52. Ibid., Pp. 346-56.
- 53. This is in line with the Mahābhārata which in the Āraṇyakaparva records the interlocution between these two about tirthayātrā.
- 54. Page 376.
- 55. Mbh., III. 80-83.
- 56. We are not reproducing here the relevant four chapters in the Mahābhārata. The introductory as well as concluding verses are being quoted in Appendix III.
- 57. Navatijivakah is not very regular. It may refer to a man in his nineties and hence very weak and about to die shortly.

- 58. Vidārayet in the Smṛticandrikā quotation is translated by Gharpure as "one should tear out". The causative form suggests that the body of a paramahamsa is to be caused to be torn asunder. It refers to the practice of exposing the corpse to be eaten by birds and beasts of pray.
- 59. XI.4- iksuyantram vrajennarah. According to Skandapurāṇa, I.2.51.27 a dealer in liquor is crushed in the ikṣuyantra in the hell.

Chapter 3

A. The Date of the Pulastyasmṛti

. Kane's View

Kane¹ has suggested the time-bracket of fourth to seventh century for the *Pulastyasmṛti*. He does not specify the evidence on which he bases his opinion. But, evidently he relies on the fact that quotations from Pulastya are recorded by Viśvarūpa (*Bālakrīḍā*), Vijnāneśvara (*Mitākṣarā*) Aparārka, Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa (*Smṛticandrikā*) and Caṇḍeśvara (*Dānaratnākara*). Of these Viśvarūpa is the earliest. Kane identifies Viśvarūpa with Sureśvara, one of the four pupils of Śaṅkara, the great Advaita philosopher, and hence narrows down the time-bracket of A.D. 750-1000 for Viśvarūpa to A.D. 800-825². It may be noted that elsewhere Kane³ himself had suggested that Sureśvara's literary activity is to be placed betweem A.D 810 and 840. It would, thus, seem that Kane places the lower limit for the date of the composition of the *Pulastyasmṛti* about a hundred years before Viśvarūpa-Sureśvara

2. The recognition of Pulastya as a Smrti writer

A rough approximation of the upper limit for the composition of the *Pulastyasmrti* can be deduced from the history of the inclusion of the name of Pulastya in the list of Dharmaśāstra writers.

But, we must be aware of the limitations of this line of argument. We have many lists of authors of ancient Dharmaśāstra texts. The absence of the name of a particular Dharmaśāstra author in any one of these lists is not a sure argument for inferring that he belonged to a later date. This is only an argumentum exsilentio. The silence about the name of that author can be explained in many possible ways. At best it can show that the author in question did not receive recognition as an authority in the circle connected with that particular list. He could have flourished even before the date of the compilation of that list. The list, in which the name of the author appears first, provides a date which serves as the upper limit before

which he has to be placed.

The name of Pulastya does not find a place in the earlier lists of Dharmaśāstra writers. The list of sixteen authors (pranetāraḥ) of Dharmaśāstras, attributed variously to Gautama⁴ and Saṅkha-Likhita⁵, does not contain the name of Pulastya. Yājñavalkya's list of eighteen expounders (vaktāraḥ) of Dharmaśāstras⁶ as also Parāśara's list of nineteen expounders⁷ does not mention the name of Pulastya. Pulastya received recognition first at the hands of Vrddha-Yājñavalkya⁸, who mentions ten names of expounders of dharma(dharmavaktāraḥ) in addition to those originally listed by Yājñavalkya. But the name of Pulastya was not retained in later lists of Smṛtis, even though their number was increased to twenty-four and thirty-six. The Caturviṃśatimata takes into account twenty-four dharmaśāstrakaras There are two slightly varying lists attributed to Paiṭhīnasi and the Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa. ⁹

Pulastya's name occurs among the authors of *upasmrtis* (*upasmrtividhāyakas*) listed in verses attributed to Angiras¹⁰. Here we have in all twenty-eight names. It seems that to the original list of eighteen (or nineteen) names were prefixed the ten names occurring in the verse, attributed to Vrddha-Yājñavalkya, which we have quoted above.

The Prayogapārijāta¹¹ gives a long list of Smrtis classified into three groups: eighteen principal Smrtikaras, eighteen upasmrtis and twenty-one other Smrtikartās We find Pulastya occurring in the two categories of eighteen upasmrtis and twenty-one other Smrtikartas. The presence of the name of Pulastya in two of the three categories in the Prayogapārijāta would seem to be a mistake, unless we infer that there were two separate Smrtis associated with the name of Pulastya. It is to be noted that out of the ten names, occurring in the first verse, which is prefixed to the verse enumerating upasmrtis, nine, including Pulastya, are found to have been repeated in the Prayogapārijāta itself. Thus, Nārada, Pulaha, Gārgya, Pulastya, Kratu and Pitāmaha are included in the list of twenty-one "other Smrtikartās", whereas Jātūkamya (for Jātukarna), Baudhāyana and Viśvāmitra are repeated in the subsequent verses listing upasmrtis, and found in Angiras. This shows that the list of upasmirtis, recorded alike by Angiras and the author of the Prayogapārijāta mentions Jātukama (or Jātūkamya), Baudhāyana

and Viśvāmitra twice. The repetition can be explained by suggesting that both Angiras and the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* inadvertently prefixed Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya's list of ten additional *smṛtis* to their list of *upasmṛtis*.

The above analysis shows that Pulastya was accommodated as a Smrti writer first by Vrddha-Yājñavalkya and later by the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* in his list of other Smrtikartās and that Angiras, followed by the author of the *Prayogapārijāta*, further included the *Pulastyasmrti* in the list of *upasmrtis*. If the occurrence of the name of a Dharmaśāstra writer in any list of the authors of Dharmaśāstra is an indication of the date of the composition of his text, it may be suggested that Pulastya belonged to a period after Yājñavalkya but before Vrddha-Yājñavalkya, Angiras and the *Prayogapārijāta*.

It is difficult to date precisely all these Dharmaśāstra authors and texts. But the latest opinion of Kane on the *Yājňavalkyasmrti* is that "it was composed during the first two centuries of the Christian era or even a little earlier."

The date of Vrddha-Yājñavalkya, though highly relevant to our present discussion, is difficult to determine. Kane describes his text as "comparatively ancient" and places it earlier than A.D. 1000.13 The original text of Vrddha-Yājñavalkya is not available. All the quotations from his text which occur in later texts have not been collected and collated. Hence, we cannot advance any definite date on the basis of the internal evidence of his text.14 The upper limit for the date of Vrddha-Yājñavalkya is provided by his name itself which presupposes the existence and wide circulation of the Yājñavalkyasmrti. The Smrti named after him has to be placed after the Yājīnavalkyasmrti. We can fix the lower limit of the date for Vrddha-Yājñavalkya on the basis of the fact that his verses are quoted, among others, by Jitendriya,15 Viśvarūpa,16 Aparārka 17 and Vijnaneśvara. 18 The date of Jitendriya is not known. Viśvarūpa being earlier than Apararka and Vijffanesvara, the dates of the latter two will not materially affect our calculations about the date of Vṛddha-Yājffavalkya. Kane¹⁹, on the basis of a due consideration of all relevant evidence, places Viśvarūpa about A.D. 800-825. Hence Vrddha-Yājñavalkya may not be later than A.D.. 700.

The dates of Angiras and the *Prayogapārijāta* have not been determined²⁰. But, certainly they would be later than Vṛddha-

K. K. Gopal & Lallanji Gopal

Yājñavalkya, whose one verse, listing ten Dharmaśāstra writers, they seem to have borrowed.

Thus, on the basis of the likely dates for Yājñavalkya and Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya we may suggest that the Dharmaśāstra attributed to Pulastya was composed after the second century but before the beginning of the seventh century of the Christian era.

3. Pulastya's Contemporaries

A verse defining śrāddha²¹ has been attributed to Pulastya by Raghunandana in his Smṛtitattva²². The same verse is ascribed to Bṛhaspati by Aparārka²³, Hemādri²⁴, Lakṣmīdhara²⁵ and Mitramiśra²⁶. In view of the specific attribution we cannot explain any one of the two views as wrong. The very fact that, inspite of the long line of established authorities attributing the verse to Bṛhaspati, Raghunandana thought it proper to mention Pulastya as its author, proves that it did occur in the Smṛti ascribed to Pulastya.

There can be two alternative explanations of the double authorship of the verse. One possibility is that both the Smrti writers drew upon a common source. But, we do not know of any earlier text which has this verse. It is not unlikely that the verse formed part of the fund of Dharmaśāstra injunctions which circulated orally and received general acceptance. When Brhaspati and Pulastya included it in their texts, they did not feel that they were borrowing it from another text.

A second possibility is that one of the two Smṛti-writers borrowed it from the other. The larger number and the earlier date of the later authorities ascribing the verse to Bṛhaspati will indicate that the general opimion favoured Bṛhaspati as its author. Bṛhaspati is generally considered to be one of the earlier and more important Smṛti authors. His chronological seniority will rule out the possibility of his borrowing it from Pulastya. This fact will, on the contrary, make a case for Pulastya copying the verse from Bṛhaspati.

The first possibility indicated above will suggest that Pulastya was not far removed from Brhaspati in time. The second possibility will show that Pulastya came after Brhaspati. Thus, the earliest chronological position, which we can assign to Pulastya, is as a junior contemporary of Brhaspati, But, how much later than

Brhaspati he actually appeared is to be determined by considering other relevant facts.

On the authority of Hemādri, the $Sr\bar{a}ddhacandrik\bar{a}^{zz}$ ascribes two verses ²⁸ on $pindad\bar{a}na$ to both Brhat-Parāśara and Pulastya. These are the two verses of Pulastya which have been quoted most by the authors of the commentaries and digests. In the $Caturvargacint\bar{a}mani$ of Hemādri the second verse has been attributed to Pulastya at several places. It is clear that the medieval writers did not have any doubt about Pulastya being the author of these verses.

A Smṛti text under the name of Bṛhat-Parāśara has been printed by Jivananda. ²⁹ Parāśara is credited with the authorship of many texts belonging to different branches of learning, including agriculture and astrology. ³⁰ The *Parāśarasmṛti* was followed by at least two other Smṛtis adopting the name of Parāśara: Vṛddha-Parāśara and Bṛhat-Parāśara. ³¹

Kane 32 has not determined the date of Brhat-Parāśara. He simply describes it as a late work. The name Brhat-Parāśara itself indicates that it belongs to a period later than the composition of the Parāśarasmṛti. Earlier Kane had suggested the time-bracket A.D. 600-900 33 for the Parāśarasmrti, but in the second edition of the first volume of his History of Dharmaśāstra he has chosen to remain vague.34 It is likely that there was an ancient Parāśarasmrti, but the extant Parāśarasmrti is definitely later than the Manusmrti and earlier than the Visnudharmottarapurāna and the Garudapurāna. It must have taken a long time to acquire recognition to be quoted by the early medieval Dharmaśāstra writers Aparārka, Vijfīāneśvara, Devannabhatta and Hemādri. Brhat-Parāśara presumes the existence of the Parāśarasmrti, but it will not be correct to describe it as "a recast of the Parāśara-smrti"35. It is a voluminous text containing about 3000 verses ³⁶ as compared to 592 verses in the Parāśarasmṛti. The text itself says that it was composed by a certain Suvrata. Whereas Parāśara does not have a detailed account on śrāddha, Brhat-Parāśara devotes a full chapter (V) to it. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that Brhat-Parāśara was recognised as being authoritative on matters concerning śrāddha.

The grouping of the names of Pulastya and Bṛhat-Parāśara is not of much help in determining the date of Pulastya. It does not seem

to be a case of two contemporaries drawing upon the same common source. The undoubted testimony of a long line of medieval Dharmaśāstra writers makes a strong case for Bṛhat-Parāśara borrowing from Pulastya. Thus, the reference to Bṛhat-Parāśara in the Śrāddhacandrikā can be useful in suggesting a lower limit beyond which Pulastya cannot be dragged.

We do not have any details about Suvrata, the author of the *Brhat-Parāśara*. The internal evidence can positivate only about its being later than the *Yājñavalkyasmrti* and *Parāśarasmrti*. The fact that Brha-Parāśara is quoted by later Dharmaśāstra writers, Bhaṭṭojī and Nandapaṇḍita, and not by earlier ones, Viśvarūpa, Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara, would indicate that Brhat-Parāśara cannot be placed much before the ninth century. Pulastya, on this ground, cannot be later than the eighth century.

A similar situation exists in relation to a verse ³⁷ quoted by the *Caturvargacintāmaņi* and the *Puruṣārthacintāmaṇi* ³⁸ relying on Hemādri. It is ascribed to both Pulastya and Satyavrata. In the present case there cannot be any question of a confusion about original authorship, because the same text mentions both the Smṛtikaras as the authors of the verse. Here also the possibility of one borrowing from the other cannot be ruled out theoretically, though it is more likely that both derived the verse from one common source. Satyavrata is a comparatively less known Smṛti writer. He would stand in the same relation to Pulastya as Pulastya does in relation to Brhaspati. The exact date of Satyavrata is also not known. He appears to have been one of the later Smṛti authors. Pulastya may be taken to have been a contemporary of Satyavrata, possibly a senior one.

Thus, we may place Pulastya between Bṛhaspati and Satyavrata. Though Jolly ³⁹ had placed Bṛhaspati in the sixth or seventh century A.D., according to Kane ⁴⁰ Bṛhaspati flourished between A.D. 200 and 400. No scholar has cared to suggest any date for Satyavrata. As the text of the Smṛti composed by him is not available, we cannot make any guess about his date.

Pulastya has two verses recommending a combination of jñāna and karma. ⁴¹ They occur in Aparārka's commentary on the Yājñavalkyasmṛti. ⁴²Lakṣmidhara in his Kṛtyakalpatarti³ attributes these verses to Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya. It is interesting to find that

Aparārka himself in another context ⁴⁴ quotes the first of these two verses from Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya. The two verses actually occur in the *Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkyasmrti*. ⁴⁵

Kane ⁴⁶ describes Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya as comparatively an early work and places it between A.D. 300 and 700. But on this account the conflicting views about the authorship of the verses do not pose any serious problem. Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya is known to have absorbed without acknowledgement several verses and passages from the *Manusmṛti*, *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, *Bhagavadgita* and *Upaniṣads*. ⁴⁷ It is, therefore, not unlikely that he borrowed the passages from Pulastya. ⁴⁸

As we have pointed out earlier, Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya is the first to recognise Pulastya as a Dharmaśāstra writer. Ouotations in later commentaries and Nibandha texts indicate that there were two separate texts under the names of Bṛhad-Yājñavalkya and Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya. Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya seems to be different from both these; but, on the basis of their names, we can place Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya after these two texts. The chronological position of Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya will not go against the suggestion that Pulastya was the original author of the verses.

As the verses occurred in both Pulastya and Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya, Aparārka cannot be criticised for attributing them to one of these at one place and to the other at another. Lakṣmidhara does not attribute them to Pulastya, possibly because he could not get a copy of the *Pulastyasmṛti*. It is not without significance that his monumental work does not contain a single quotation from the *Pulastyasmṛti*.

The borrowing of the two Pulastya verses by Brhadyogi-Yājflavalkya will require us to place Pulastya before Brhadyogi-Yājflavalkya.

4. Tirthayatraparva and Pulastyasmrti

One possible clue to the date of Pulastya is provided by the *Tirthayāpatrārva* in the *Āranyakaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*. Here Pulastya appears as the expounder of the religious creed of pilgrimage. In the surviving extracts of the *Pulastyasmrti* we have passages eulogising the religious merit of pilgrimage. On reaching a *mahātirtha* there is no sin caused by lapse even in the case of eclipse

and funeral rites.⁵¹ Special merit attaches to bathing in the rivers, particularly Gangā, Sarayū, Irāvatī and Devikā, the confluences of rivers, and places near the Sivalinga.⁵² Bathing at the confluence of big rivers and touching the waters of the sea are recommended for purification in the case of dog-bite.⁵³ In a *tīrtha* there is no impurity caused by death.⁵⁴ Gayā had come to be recognised as the foremost place for performing ancestral rites.⁵⁵ We must emphasise that the surviving quotations do not indicate that there was a separate chapter or section in the *Pulastyasmrti* giving a full account of the various important *tīrthas*, the special acts or rites to be performed there, special occasions for a visit to the *tīrthas* and the religious merit which pilgrimage fetches.

Now, the question is: which came first, the *Tirthayātrāparva* or the *Pulastyasmṛti*. Are we to suppose that the tradition as recorded in the *Tirthayātrāparva*, which honoured Pulastya as the introducer of the religious practice of pilgrimage, was the main reason compelling the author of the *Pulastyasmṛti* to include in his text verses referring to the religious merit accruing from bathing at a *tirtha?* We may also consider a second possibility that, in attributing to Pulastya the credit for introducing the creed of pilgrimage, the author of the *Tirthayātrāparva* was moved by a consideration of the presence of verses praising the sanctifying qualities of the *tirthas* in the *Pulastyasmṛti*.

As there are no common verses in the two texts, we cannot maintain that one borrowed from the other. It is equally difficult to be positive about one being aware of the presence of the other. However, it is to be noted that if the *Pulastyasmrti* had existed before the composition of the *Tirthayātrāparva*, the author of the *Mahābhārata* chapters would have accommodated some verses from the Smṛti in his own text. But, this argument cannot be considered to be compelling. We know that the *Mahābhārata*, at many places, records the views of many ancient sages and thinkers. In the absence of the original writings of these celebrities we cannot be sure if the *Mahābhārata* reproduces their own words. Considering the same form of verses, similar terms, and identical style of presentation, we may infer that the *Mahābhārata*, even in recording views traditionally attributed to these people, used its own form of structure and style of presentation. The possibility of the

Pulastyasmṛti providing the basis for the Tirthayātrāparva seems to be remote. We cannot be sure if there was an earlier text recording Pulastya's views about tirthayātrā which has not survived the passage of centuries.

But, if the *Tirthayātrāparva* preceded the *Pulastyasmṛti*, the author of the Smṛti text was under no obligation to incorporate in his own text verses occurring in the *Tirthayātrāparva*. The *Tirthayātrāparva* was, by no means, a composition from Pulastya's own pen. In composing an independent text the author of the *Pulastyasmṛti* would be inclined to avoid passages occurring in the *Tirthayātrāparva*. He would instead prefer to formulate in his own way the views on different subjects. In doing so he would have been naturally influenced by the image of Pulastya's personality as preserved in the tradition.

We cannot rule out the possibility of the author of the *Pulastyasmrti* being aware of the tradition crediting Pulastya with the introduction of the religious practice of pilgrimage. In any case the *Pulastyasmrti* verses emphasising the religious sanctity of the *tirthas* will refer to a period when the practice of pilgrimage had come into vogue.

Thus, the importance of the evidence of the *Tirthayātrāparva* lies in offering a date before which we cannot place the *Pulastyasmṛti*. On the basis of "the frequent descriptions of the various *tirthas*, and the frequency with which the personalities in the Epics are made to visit them" Dhairyabala P. Vora ⁵⁶ suggests that "by the time of the final edition of the Epic, *tirthayātrā* must have been a very popular practice." She considers the *Tirthayātrāparva* to be a later interpolation added some time after the Christian era. Dr. Vora, thus, seems to be inclined to place the *Tīrthayātrāparva* in the range A.D.100-300. The *Pulastyasmṛti* may be placed in this time-bracket, or in its later half, or a little later.

Padmapurāņa and Pulastyasmṛti

We notice a significant difference in the coverage of Dharmaśāstra topics in the *Vāmanapurāṇa* and the *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa* of the *Padmapurāṇa*. In both the cases the narrator is Pulastya. In the *Vāmanapurāṇa* he addresses Nārada and in the *Padmapurāṇa* he expounds to Bhisma. We may explain the pattern in the

Vämanapurāna in a number of ways. But the *Padmapurāna* structure definitely shows that it is based on the *Tīrthayātrāparva* of the *Āranyakaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*.

Further, the passages in the Vāmanapurāna occur casually and briefly and concern only some of the topics of Dharmaśāstra. As against this, in the Padmapurāna the Smrti portions, though emboxed in the narratives, appear to have a distinct position. They are more detailed in their account and cover a larger number of Dharmaśāstra topics. In the *Padmapurāna* Pulastya deals with these topics as if they are regular subjects falling under his purview. Pulastya in the *Padmapurāna* appears as a recognised authority on Dharmaśāstra. This is an improvement upon the position in the Mahābhārata. Pulastya is not restricted to tirthayātrā; he expounds on many important topics falling under the wide scope of Dharmaśāstra. The *Padmapurāna* will imply that the *Pulastyasmrti* had long been in circulation. The *Padmapurāna* is taken by Kane ⁵⁷ to have borrowed its Smrti material before A.D. 1000. R.C.Hazra⁵⁸ suggests differing dates for the inclusion of the Smrti portions in this Purāna. Those in the Adi, Bhūmi, Brahma, Pātāla and Uttara Khandas are generally placed in the time-bracket of A.D. 900 to 1400. In the Srstikhanda Hazra proposes the dates A.D. 600-750 for chapters 7, 9-11, 15, 17 and 31, A.D. 800-900 for chapters 20, 25, 27-28 and 36, and A.D.1000-1400 for chapters 43-62 and 75 onwards. Hence, we may suggest, on the basis of the Dharmaśāstra portions in the Srstikhanda, that Pulastya had established himself as a Dharmaśāstra writer before the seventh century.

6. Internal Evidence

(i) Development of Dharmaśāstra Literature- There are indications that the text did not belong to an early stage in the history of the Smṛti literature. It presupposes a rich growth of the Smṛtis. By that time a number of schools had emerged. The Smṛtis had come to cover a wide range of topics. On account of their wide range and varying provisions the Smṛtis created the need for determining the propriety of the rules, which particular provision in a Smṛti is to be followed in view of the apparently conflicting views. The question of the authority, which the different Smṛtis possess, became a matter of discussion. In determining it an effort was made to trace the

source from which they had originated. It was felt that in many cases the seed of the Smrti injunctions could not be traced in the Vedic texts.⁵⁹

The text further says that the advice of those people steadfast in dharma is wholesome who contemplate about the meaning of the Dharmaśāstra and those who know the Vedas. 60 The Dharmasūtras and the early Smrtis in listing the sources of dharma mention the memory and conduct of those who know the Vedas. 61 The conduct of the virtuous people (śistācāra) 62 or the virtuous conduct (sadācāra) 63 was also included in the list of the sources of dharma. Āpastamba 64 mentions the injunctions of those who know dharma to be authority. This could have served as the basis for the statement made in the *Pulastyasmrti*, but is not actually identical with it. The present verse presupposes a rich Dharmaśāstra literature. In view of the diverse and, at times, conflicting provisions, the need for coordinating and synthesising the Smrtis was felt. The Smrti texts by themselves did not offer a clear direction.65 They had to be interpreted by those who were well versed in the Dharmaśāstra texts to yield a proper meaning. The Dharmaśāstras had acquired a richness and respectability to be studied seriously by a group of scholars who came to be recognised as experts for these texts.

The surviving quotations do not concern any topic related to legal dispute or $vyavah\bar{a}ra$. If it is not a chance feature, it may have an important bearing on the nature of the original Pulastyasmrti and its probable date. We know that the later Smrtis sometimes did not give a proportionate importance to the topics of $vyavah\bar{a}ra$ and gave more coverage to $\bar{a}c\bar{a}ra$, $pr\bar{a}ya\acute{s}citta$, $\acute{s}uddhi$ and $\acute{s}r\bar{a}ddha$. Such an attitude was possibly dictated by the fact that the coverage of $vyavah\bar{a}ra$ in Manu and Yājñavalkya, followed by further elaboration in Nārada, Bṛhaspati and Kātyāyana, did not leave much scope and practical utility for their discussion by later, minor Smṛtis. Thus, the absence of verses dealing with $vyavah\bar{a}ra$ in the Pulastyasmrti may indicate that it belonged to a period later than the earlier Śmṛtis of Manu, Yājñavalkya, Nārada, Bṛhaspati and Kātyāyana.

(ii) Kṛṣṇājinadāna - Hemādri in his Caturvargacintāmant⁷ quotes the provisions about kṛṣṇājinadāna from two sources -

Pulastya and the *Visnudharmottara*. The details of the procedure in the two are the same, the only difference being that whereas Pulastya lays down the provisions in prose, the *Visnudharmottara* employs verses to present them. Of the two, Pulastya seems to be earlier. The account in Pulastya is simple and direct. It is confined to the actual details of the procedure and does not contain any irrelevant or additional statement. It has the form of a regular chapter on a specific topic. As against this, the section in the *Visnudharmottara* does not have a separate distinct existence. The account has been woven into the texture of the plan of the text by prefixing an introductory verse and inserting the words *bhūpa* and *rājendra* in the vocative case.

The two accounts are closely similar in respect of the details of the procedure and the words and expressions used. The *Visnu-dharmottara* is encyclopaedic in nature. It takes material from diverse sources and, with some suitable changes, incorporates it in its structure. In doing so it does not care to acknowledge the source. The very fact that Pulastya chose to present his account in prose indicates that it was his own original formulation. This is significant, because the major part of the Smṛti is in verses. It was quite in order for the author of the Smṛti to lay down the procedure of the *dāna* in prose. The author of the *Viṣnudharmottara* versifies the procedure. In this process he systematises and elaborates the provisions about the four pots to be placed in the four directions and the objects (*kṣīra*, *dadhi*, *ghṛta* and *kṣaura*) to be kept in them. In the *Pulastyasmṛti* they are lumped together without a proper demarcation of their specific contents.

Another difference is to be seen in respect of the description of the donee Brāhmana. Pulastya says that he is to be āhitāgni, sarvānga-sampūrna, patrasamyukta and vidvān. The Viṣnudharmottara adds that he is to be a supāṭhaka, pravaktā, yājnika and smrtivid. In the Pulastyasmrti the sentences to be uttered by the donor, while making the gift, and by the donee, while receiving it, are simple and appropriate to the occasion. The Viṣnudharmottara transforms the utterance of the donor into a verse and adds that the donee is to recite the mantra, Aditirdyauh with pranava prefixed to it, both in the beginning and at the end of the donation.

The more significant change in the Visnudharmottara relates

to the additional remark that the $d\bar{a}na$ is to be given along with cow, land and gold and that by making such a gift even a person who has committed all the sins attains Brahman.⁷²

The comparative analysis of the provisions about *kṛṣṇājinadāna* in the two texts shows that Pulastya has to be placed before the *Visnudharmottara*.

(iii) Week-days- Another possible indicator of the date of the *Pulastyasmrti* is the verse which attaches special merit to bathing on Ravivāra, Angāravāra and Sanivāra.⁷³ This shows the establishment of the practice of naming the week-days after the planets and viewing them as specially sanctifying.

Some scholars believe that the Indians borrowed the practice of naming week-days after planets from the Greeks. They hold that Indian texts mentioning the names of week-days after the names of planets cannot be dated before the end of the second century of the Christian era, when this practice was established among the Greeks. According to Fleet, Europe received the Jewish calendar of week-days in the third century and India received it from Europe.

But this cannot serve as a reliable indicator, "No one knows exactly when the week-days were named and who were the people that first employed the current names of the week-days".76 The planetary week seems to have originated in Egypt and not in Greece. There is no definite evidence for its prevalence in Greece or any other European country before the second century B.C. Its introduction in Greece cannot be placed earlier than the first century of the Christian era. 77 The Sanskrit names of the week-days do not show any Greek influence nor are Greek names recorded in any ancient Sanskrit text. 78 Although the earliest inscription in India to mention a week- day is the Eran Stone Pillar Inscription of Budhagupta (Gupta era 165 = A.D.484), ⁷⁹ literary evidence makes it extremely probable, if not certain, that the worship of the planets and knowledge of the week-days presided over by them was known to the Indians at least betwen 100B.C. and 100A.D.80 There is no cogent argument against the indigenous origin of the system in India,81 but we need not dismiss the possibility that the idea of arranging days into weeks was suggested by the practice in Babylon and Syria.

60

Thus, the reference to the names of week-days need not be taken as an indication of a later date for the text. An early date around the beginning of the Christian era cannot be dismissed as improbable on the basis of this argument. But, considering the absence of the practice in any early inscription, it would seem that the practice gained general currency in the Gupta period and hence a date in the later part of the Gupta period will seem to be more likely.

- (iv) Fourfold Classification of Sannyāsins- The Pulastyasmṛti 82 lays down the procedure for the antyeṣṭi of four types of ascetics: kutīcaka, bahūdaka, haṃsa and paramahaṃsa. This division of the ascetics83 into four classes is to be found in the Anuśāsanaparvaof the Mahābhārata, 84Vaikhānasasūtra 85 and Bhikṣukopaniṣad. It is also found in Laghu-Viṣṇu, 86 Prajāpati 87 and Agnipurāṇa. 88 Hence the Pulastyasmṛti is to be dated not before the Anuśāsanaparva of the Mahābhārata and the Vaikhānasasūtra. It may be placed in the same period to which the Smṛtis of Laghu-Viṣnu and Prajāpati belong.
- (v) Religious condition: Vaisnavism and Religious eclecticism-The extracts contain significant references to religious beliefs and practices, which can serve as an indication of the times to which the original text belonged. It is clear that the author regarded Viṣṇu as his favourite deity. A person is required to begin his day by offering his prayers to Viṣṇu. He should awaken Viṣṇu in the morning by sounding musical instruments. 89 To overcome various types of difficulties he should recite the names of Viṣṇu. 90 If a man talks to a pāṣandin, he should meditate on bhagavān Viṣṇu under the name of Acyuta and pray to him. 91

The theory of the Avatāras of Viṣṇu seems to have been fully established. The Avatāras actually named are Rāma, Paraśurāma, Nṛṣiṃha, Vāmana (Trivikrama), Balabhadra and Vāsudeva, 20 but, it is not likely that other incarnations had not been recognised. The author evidently accepted Viṣṇu as the supreme god (sarvasarveśvara 3 and devadeva 4). The names of Viṣṇu include Kāma, Kāmapriya, Kānta, Kāmapāla, Hari, Ānanda, Mādhava Puruṣottama, Dāmodara, Keśava, Puṇḍarīkākṣa, Ḥṛṣīkeśa, Acyuta, Amṛta, Aparājita, Cakrin, Gadin, Śārngin, Khadgin, Ajita,

Adhipa, Nārāyaṇa, Jalaśāyin, Ģaruḍadhvaja, Ananta, Śārngadhara, Śrīdhara, Paryankaśāyin, Jagatpūti, Śrīśa, Viśoka and Govinda. Srāma is included in the list of Avatāras, but the various names of Viṣnu (Mādhava, Dāmodara, Keśava, Hṛṣīkeśa, Cakrin, Gadin and Govinda) indicate that Vāsudeva was considered to be more important. All the three Rāmas, Rāma, Paraśurāma and Balarāma (Balabhadra), are mentioned as the Avatāras of Viṣṇu. Saranga saranga

It is clear from the provisions about *tripundra* that the concept of the trinity of Siva, Viṣṇu and Brahmā was fully established ⁹⁷. We do not notice any indication of a sectarian animosity. On the contrary, the text, though regarding Viṣṇu as the supreme god, attaches great religious merit to taking bath at such a place in the Gangā near which a Sivalinga is placed.⁹⁸

Scholars have traced seeds of the concept of avatara in the Vedic literature. According to P.V. Kane, 99 the theory of the avatāras of Visnu had been prevalent some centuries before the Christian era. H.C.Raychaudhuri 100 places its clear formulation in the third century B.C. The theory seems to have grown and changed in course of time. There is no unanimity about the number of avatāras in various texts. The Bhāgavatapurāna 101 at one place admits that the avatāras of Visnu are countless. Even in one single text we find different lists of avatāras.102 It is not possible to arrange various lists in a chronological order. The names in the lists seem to have been changed according to the personal faith of the compiler and the tendencies of his own region and times. At a certain stage the number of avatāras came to be standardised as ten. But, even then there was no unanimity about the names actually included in the list of ten avatāras. The important points of difference related to the inclusion of Buddha and the particular Rāma or Rāmas accommodated in the list.

The *Pulastyasmrti* does not mention the number of *avatāras*, nor does it enumerate the names in any sequence. Hence we cannot argue on the basis either of the number of names actually mentioned or of the names that are absent. Thus, the absence of Buddha can be explained on the ground that even after Buddha was included in the list of the *avatāras* of Viṣnu, a feeling of antagonism against him persisted in some quarters. ¹⁰³

The inclusion of Balarama in the list of avataras was the result

of the impact of the caturvyūha doctrine of the old Pāñcarātra system. The vyūha doctrine arose out of the deification of several Vrsnī vīras. Of these Sankarsana or Balarāma was a more important person and, before the beginning of the Christian era, was worshipped independently over a wide area even outside the Vrsni circle. 104 His memory as an exponent of the Satvata or Pancaratra system is preserved in the Mahābhārata and the Ahirbudhnya Samhitā. Later the worshippers of Sankarsana possibly merged themselves with those of Vāsudeva-Krsna. In the Mahābhārata⁰⁵ Balarāma, under the name of Sātvata, is included in the list of avatāras The Ahirbudhnya Samhitā, 106 a Pāñcarātra text, mentions him as Ananta in its list of thirty-nine vibhavas (manifestions of the Supreme Being) which includes all the well-known avatāras. The Bhāgavatapurāna names Rāma Haladhara in only one of its four lists which enumerates twenty-two avatāras. 107 The late Smrti text of Vrddha-Hārīta 108 is among the earliest to include Balabhadra in a list of ten avatāras, but it differs from the more standard list of the Varāhapurāṇa 109 in omitting Paraśurāma and replacing Buddha by Hayagrīva. Jayadeva in his Gitagovinda accommodates Rāma Haladhara in the list of ten avatāras by identifying Krsna with Visnu himself. The growth of a tradition representing Sankarsana as an incarnation of Seşa or Ananta Nāga was possibly one of the factors which caused the removal of his name from the list of the avatāras of Visnu. But, the main reason probably was the growth in the popularity of other avatāras in the times of the Gupta kings. 110 The name of Balarama would seem to have been generally dropped from the list of the ten avatāras of Visnu, prepared in the later part of the Gupta period, though it persisted for some time in the Pāñcarātra circles.

Besides Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, Paraśurāma was among the earliest to be recognised as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. According to D.C. Sircar¹¹¹, he was conceived as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu some time after the second century A.D. The Nārāyaṇīya section in the Sāntiparva at one place refers to only four *avatāras*, but does not mention him;¹¹² at another place in the same section his name appears in a list of six *avatāras*;¹¹³ The lists of ten *avatāras* generally retain the name of Rāma Jāmadagnya or Rāma Bhārgava.¹¹⁴ In some circles, it seems, Paraśurāma, though accepted as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, did not

receive equal honour. As in the case of Buddha, he was not considered fit for worship. Vṛddha-Hārīta 115 says that a noble Vaiṣṇava is not to worship Bhārgava and Buddha in all the rites. Possibly, after the incorporation of Rāma-Dāśarathi among the avatāras of Viṣṇu, the conflict between the two Rāmas and the discomfiture of Paraśurāma in it signified his loss of prestige. Some of his acts and certain traits of his character could also have contributed to his lower prestige.

Rāma-Dāśarathi appears to have been late in being recognised as an avatāra of Visnu. R.G.Bhandarkar 116 suggested that the cult of Rāma came into existence about the eleventh century. But, subsequent researches have exposed the weakness in this theory. 117 No doubt the worshippers of Rāma did not organise themselves into an independent group in earlier times, but there is ample evidence to show that since the Gupta period Rāma was worshipped as an avatāra of Visnu. Kālidāsa in his Raghuvamśa 118 mentions Rāma as an incarnation of Hari. His Meghadūta 119 refers to the foot-print of Raghupati on the Rāmagiri and to the waters in the āśramas of Rāmagiri as being holy on account of Sītā bathing in them. Varāhamihira in the Brhatsamhitā 120 provides rules about the making of Rāma's image. The name of Rāma Dāśarathi occurs in the earliest lists of avatāras in the Mahābhārata, 121 Rāmāyana 122 and the Purānas. 123 In some lists the name of Rāma appears without any distinguishing appellation, 124 hence we cannot be sure about his identification either with Rāma-Bhārgava or with Rāma-Dāśarathi. In the light of the above we need not drag the date of a text to the early medieval period on the ground that it mentions Rāma-Dāśarathi as one of the incarnations of Visnu; it could be pushed back as early as the Gupta period.

All the three Rāmas appear together in the *Pulastyasmrti*. The classic appearance of the three together as *avatāras* of Viṣṇu is to be found in the *Gītagovinda* of Jayadeva. Paraśurāma, Rāma Dhanurdhara and Ananta (Rāma Haladhara) are included in the *Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā* ¹²⁵ in a list of thirty-nine *vibhavas* (manifestations of the Supreme Being). One of the lists in the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* ¹²⁶ mentions the names of Rāma-Jāmadagnya, Rāma-Dāśarathi and Rāma-Haladhara among twenty-two *avatāras*. Among the early references to the three Rāmas together we may note

the passage in the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Sāntiparya. 127

Considering the introduction of the name of Rāma-Dāśarathi and the retention of the name of Balarāma as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu we may place the *Pulastyasmṛti* in the later part of the Gupta period.

The Pulastvasmrti recognises Brahmā, Visnu and Siva as the three principal gods without any sectarian rivalry. It breathes an atmosphere of religious eclecticism and toleration. Traces of henotheism and monotheism can be detected in the Vedic literature. The first necessary stage in the formulation of the concept of trimurti is the establishment of the superiority of these three over other gods. The Vedic pantheon is gradually transformed and paves the way for the emergence of these three gods. From very early times there was a tendency to bridge sectarian gulf and to bring about sectarian harmony and peace. The practice of making syncretic images projects that tendency. The syncretic images of Hari-Hara-Pitāmaha and Hari-Hara-Hiranyagarbha fuse together the three principal deities of the Brahmanical faith. The concept of trimurti is a unique feature of Brahmanical religion. Though they possess separate personalities and character, the three are conceived as forming a wonderful happy Trinity. There is no clash in their nature and functioning. They have separate roles to perform, which merge to create a harmonious unity. Brahmā creates. Visnu sustains and Rudra annihilates. One of the earliest expressions of this Trinity is to be found in the \overline{A} ranyakaparva of the M ahābhārata. 128 In the generally the three are represented as acting in Mahābhārata unison, often without their separate functions being clearly demarcated.129 In the Purānas the Trinity is more clearly noticed.130 This seems to reflect the religious moods of the Gupta period. In the Raghuvamśa 131 Hari is eulogised as having a triple manifestation and salutation is offered to him first as the creator of the universe, then as its sustainer, and finally as its annihilator. In the Kumārasambhava 132 it is Brahmā Svāyambhuva who is designated as Trimūrti. Before creation he alone exists; later, for the differentiation of the three qualities, he assumes distinct forms. This type of development well suits the spirit of religious toleration, peace and harmony which is so eminently confirmed for the Gupta period by the numerous literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence of the period.

Gangā and Tīrthas-

An important feature of the religious beliefs of the times is the high regard for the Ganga. One bathing in the Ganga does not enter the pretavoni. 133 Gangā removes the sins of ten births (daśajanmāghahā) and is known as the remover of sin (nānaharā). 134 A person, who performs bathing, charity and other acts in the Ganga, even in a false manner for gaining profit, fame and honour, goes to heaven. 135 Special merit attaches to the recitation of the Sandhyā mantra in the Gangā. 136 The bigger rivers are designated as mahānadis. 137 By taking bath at the confluence of big rivers (mahānadvāśca sangame) a man is absolved of the contamination caused by dog-bite. 138 The expanded geographical horizon of the times is indicated by the provision that such a purification is obtained by touching the sea. 139 Evidently sea was known intimately and was associated with special religious efficacy. Certain highly sanctified tirthas were known as mahātirthas. 140

P.V.Kane¹⁴¹ controverts the suggestion that the institution of pilgrimage wes started by the Buddhists and Jains.¹⁴² He points out that the importance of holy places, visiting them, and performing religious rites there were known in the *Brāhmana* period. The term *tirtha* occurs in the Rk and other *Samhitās* as signifying a road, a way or a ford in a river. ¹⁴³ Even in the Dharmasūtras ¹⁴⁴ it retains its earlier usage as a ford and does not seem to have acquired currency as the term for a place of pilgrimage. ¹⁴⁵ Kane ¹⁴⁶ points out that the *tirthas* do not occupy a very prominent position in the the Sūtras and ancient Smṛtis like those of Manu and Yājñavalkya, but are highly lauded as superior even to the sacrifices in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purānas*. The practice of pilgrimage as a religious rite possibly came into vogue from the third century of the Christian era.

The concept of $mah\bar{a}t\bar{i}rthas$ is also an indicator of a later development. After several places came to be recognised as holy $t\bar{i}rthas$, the designation of $mah\bar{a}t\bar{i}rtha$ was applied to some to magnify their religious importance. The tendency has a parallel in the field of polity. Even a mighty emperor like Aśoka was satisfied with the ordinary title of $r\bar{a}j\bar{a}$. The practice of using high-sounding titles like $r\bar{a}j\bar{a}tir\bar{a}ja$ and $mah\bar{a}r\bar{a}ja$ came into vogue with the foreign dynasties, particularly the Kuṣānas. In the Gupta period the title of $mah\bar{a}r\bar{a}ja$ came to be used even by feudatories and petty rulers. The

reference to mahātīrthas may suggest a date in the later part of the Gupta period.

The confluences of rivers were recognised as sacred places from the Vedic times. In the *Rgveda* ¹⁴⁷ itself there is an indication of the sacredness of the confluences of rivers. The confluence of Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī was considered to be the proper place for the performance of an *iṣṭi*. ¹⁴⁸ The recognition of Prayāga as the foremost *tīrtha* was largely on account of the confluence of the Gaṅgā and Yamunā. This in its turn helped the tendency to attach sanctity to the confluences of other rivers. A *Khila* verse, ¹⁴⁹ usually placed in *Rgveda* X.75, is the earliest known reference to the highly sacred character of the confluence of the Gaṅga and Yamunā. The *Rāmāyaṇa* ¹⁵⁰ mentions the confluence of the two rivers, but does not say much about the greatness of Prayāga which is described in detail in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purānas*. ¹⁵¹

In view of the limited geographical horizon of the *Rgveda* scholars generally hold that Gangā was not much known in those times. ¹⁵² In the *Nadīstuti* hymn¹⁵³ Gangā is mentioned first among the rivers, but, as it occurs in the tenth Maṇḍala of the *Rgveda*, some scholars take it to refer to a later period. The only other reference in the *Rgveda* is the occurance of the word *Gāngyaḥ*, ¹⁵⁴ which possibly means 'growing on (the banks of) the Gāngā'. From the *Manusmṛti* ¹⁵⁵ it can be inferred that Gangā had come to be recognised as being among the holiest. The position of Gangā as the foremost river is indicated by the *Bhagavadgītā* ¹⁵⁶ in which Kṛṣṇa identifies himself with Gangā among the rivers. The eulogy of Gangā and its purifying and sanctifying qualities find a prominent and detailed description in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*. ¹⁵⁷

The concept of the sacredness of sea is also an interesting development. It may be noted that whereas the Dharmaśāstras look down upon sea-vogage and people living near the sea, sea itself came to acquire a sacred character. We can notice an early expression of the holiness of sea in the Sānkhāyana Brāhmand. Here samudra is mentioned in close association with tirtha and as absorbing everything. But, tirtha, described as agādha (unfathomable), evidently refers to rivers and not to places of pilgrimage. The sea receives the rivers. As the rivers were considered to be sacred, the sea, with which they merged, also came to acquire a holy character.

The Purāṇas mention the rivers flowing to the sea as sacred and, in the same context, describe the sea also as sacred. The $N\bar{a}rad\bar{t}yapur\bar{a}na$ 160 culogises sea as the king among the $t\bar{t}rthas$ and as the lord of the rivers.

In view of the portions dealing with the $t\bar{t}rthas$ and the eulogy of Gangā and the sea the *Pulastyasmṛti* cannot be placed before the Gupta period.

Pāsandins or Buddhists-

The provisions about purification, after one has come into contact with a $p\bar{a}sandin$ and has spoken to him, reflects a period of bitter reaction against the growing number of heretics. They are not referred to by their specific name but are designated as $p\bar{a}sandins$ (or $p\bar{a}sand\bar{a}h$) ¹⁶¹. The application of the term $p\bar{a}sandins$ to heretics is a later usage. $P\bar{a}sanda$ originally meant a group or corporate body. Buddhism was the first in the religious circles to establish a Sangha or corporation of its monks. On account of this peculiar institution the Buddhists came to be designated $p\bar{a}sandins$. The original usage of the term does not imply any contempt. ¹⁶² But, in course of time in the hands of the orthodox schools the term came to signify a heretic, a hypocrite.

The *Pulastyasmrti* provides us some details about the ideas and practices of the pāṣaṇdins. They are said to have given up the duties based on the division of varnas and āśramas as prescribed by the Srutis and Smrtis. They cause the intermixing of the varnas (varnasankartkarttārah) They speak ill of the rites and rituals as laid down by the Rk, Yajus and Sāman Samhitās; they do not have faith (aprītih) in the Vedic rites. There is a repeated reference to their performing improper deeds (vikarma). They are persons of evil conduct (duhśilāh,durācārāh). They have given up the performance of the sacraments (vrātyāh samskāravarjitāh). They praise the qualities of evil food (dustannagunavadinah). They proclaim that nothing else exists (nānyadastīti vādinah). They perform fake religious rites (vaidālavratinah). They indulge in austerities without undergoing purification (nihśaucavakramatayah) They are deluded $(vimohit\bar{a}h)$ and have lost the sense of proper conduct (viveka). Their wisdom is destroyed (kṣinajñānāh). When asked by friendly and kind learned people, they give replies full of distorted logic

(kūtayuktisamanvita). They are conceited on account of their cunning reasoning (yuktiprāgalbhyadurmadāh). They perform sinful acts thinking of Dharma (dharma-buddhyā tataḥ pāpam kurvanti) and earn their living through the pretext of religion (dharmavyājopajīvinaḥ). The verses are full of derogatory adjectives: fools (mūḍhāḥ), mean people fīt to go to the hell (narakārhānrādhamāḥ) men of sinful deeds (pāpakarmāṇaḥ), conceited (dambhikāḥ), wicked-minded (śaṭhabuddhayaḥ) and resorting to devilish feelings (āsuraṃ bhāvamāśritāh).

The Brahmanical tradition often contemptuously refers to the heterodox systems and schools as nāstikas and pāṣaṇḍins. The orthodox tradition did not tolerate those who did not believe in the existence of God and did not subscribe to the authority of the Vedas. But, in the present case we do not have a denouncing of the heretics in general. The verses do not leave any doubt about the identification of the pāsandins. It is clear that here we have an account of the Buddhists, their beliefs and conduct. The expression nānyadastīti vādinah refers to their being atheists. They opposed belief in the existence of God and the superiority of the Vedas. The expression may further be taken to refer to the Buddhist doctrine of void or śūnyatā, including both pudgalaśūnyatā and dharmaśūnyatā. Likewise, the use of the expression duhśilāh is not without a special significance. It may be a sarcastic allusion to the fact that though śila (practical morality) occupies an important place in the Buddhist ethics, being one of the three sections of the Middle Way for achieving the final goal,163 their conduct in the final analysis cannot be approved. Again, in the two expressions, dharmabuddhyā tatah pāpam kurvanti and dharmavyājopajīvinah, the term dharma has a special significance. In Buddhism dharma is one of the three ratnas and stands for the Buddhist religion. Here dharma, though apparently meaning righteous duty, may imply a veiled, ironical reference to Buddhism. The two expressions suggest the decline in the morals of Buddhist monks and refer to the wealth and prosperity which Buddhist establishments received in the name of dharma. Lastly, the text refers to the dexterity of the Buddhists in marshalling logic in support of their principles (yuktiprāgalbhya). It further says that the pāṣandins used false logic (kūṭayukti) to propound their doctrines. We know that in the early stages of its history Buddhism

did not apply itself much to arguments and logic. Later Buddhist scholars marshalled logic in support of their formulation of principles. Buddhism played a vital role in the development of logic as a discipline.

Thus, the presentation of the Buddhist system in the *Pulastyasmrti* corresponds to a later stage in its history. Buddhism had gained enough following to be reckoned as a force. Its bitter criticism by the orthodox writers is an indication of its popularity. Its social views and behaviour could no longer be ignored as a matter concerning a small, limited group. Its philosophical views had come for a wide circulation. Besides its objectionable rites and behaviour the money which the Buddhist monks and monasteries were receiving also had acquired a notorious proportion.

Considering the evidence and arguments listed above we may place the *Pulastyasmṛti* in the group of later Smṛtis. Its religious life and practices seem to reflect the realities of the Gupta period, especially in its later part. Thus, we are inclined to place the text in the rough time-bracket of A.D.300-500, preferably the second half, A.D.400-500. This leaves enough margin for the text to gain recognition as a Dharmaśāstra authority at the hands of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya and to be quoted by Viśvarūpa.¹⁶⁴

(B) Importance of Pulastyasmrti

On account of the survival of the text in the from of scattered passages the contributions of the *Pulastyasmṛti* to the socioreligious system of the Dharmaśāstras has not been attempted. Now, that the available passages have been collected, we can formulate an estimate of its importance as a Smṛti text, howsoever incomplete it may be.

It is to be recognised that all the passages which have survived were considered to be significant provisions in the *Pulastyasmṛti*. Even on points on which we have similar provisions in some other Smṛts, the very fact that the medieval authors deemed it proper to reproduce the passage from the *Pulastyasmṛti* shows that these quotations were considered to have a specific significance as words of authority in the history of Smṛti injunctions.

Of these passages some seem to have possessed a special importance and have been quoted by several medieval writers. Here we would like to list the following passages:

II.1.4- astronomical conjunctions meritorious for bathing in a river; II.4.1-2- performance of sandhyā as obligatory; II.5.2-leaving remnants in eating; II.5.5- occasions when not to eat; II.6.13- intoxicating drinks; II.4.2-5- meritorious occasions for dāna; VII.9-10-removing impurity caused by dog-bite; X.5.1-sapindīkarana; X.7.2- food to be offered in śrāddha; X.7.5-7-occasions for offering pindadāna; X.7-8- performance of separate śrāddha; X. 8.1- performance of śrāddha of mātāmahas.

Some of the passages have been reproduced more than once in the same text. They were considered authoritative and were used to support the Dharmaśāstric injunctions in a number of contexts.

It is interesting to note that some of the provisions in this Smṛti were taken to be authoritative even when they clashed with the injunctions in the earlier and major Smṛtis. Thus, Yājñavalkya prescribes sacrificial food, flesh and honey as offerings in śrāddha for all varṇas, but Pulastya provides that a Brāhmaṇa is to offer the hermit's food, a Kṣatriya and a Vaiśya flesh, and a Śūdra honey. Vijñāneśvara upholds the injunction in the *Pulastyasmṛti* as worthy of being followed.

The significance of some of the passages in the text is evident inasmuch as we do not find much parallel to them in other Smrti texts. Among such passages the more important ones are:

I.1.nature of Smṛti authority; I.2- synthesis of jnana and karma; II.1- bathing (snāna); II.2- ahata garments; II.5- meals (bhojana); II.6- intoxicating drinks (madyāni); III- devapūjā, V-kṛṣṇājinadāna; VI- purification (śuddhi); VII- śuddhi for dog-bite; VII- śuddhi for talking to a pāṣandin; IX- expiation (prāyaścitta); X.1- antyeṣṭi; X.2- sūtaka; X.7- śrāddhadāna; X.8- śrāddha for mātāmaha, and XI- funeral rites for ascetics.

The text, however, does not have any importance for legal history. There is hardly any topic of *vidhi* or law discussed in it; the entire work is devoted to a discussion of non-legal topics.

References

- 1. History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol.I (2nd edn.), p.517.
- 2. Ibid.. Pp.562-64.
- 3. Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1928, Pp.289-93.
- 4. Quoted by Apararka, P.7.
- 5. Quoted in Viramitrodaya, Paribhāsāprakāśa. p.16.
- I.4-5. The number becomes twenty if Sankha and Likhita are counted separately and Yājñavalkya is also included.
- 7. I.12-15.
- Ouoted by Viśvarūpa on Yāj. I.4-5-नारदः पुलहो गार्ग्यः पुलस्त्यः शौनकः क्रतुः । बौधायनो जातकर्णो विश्वामित्रः पितामहः ॥
- 9. See Kane, Op.cit. Pp.303-4, f.n. 312-13.
- Ouoted in Smrticandrikā, I, P.1; Caturvargacintāmaņi, Dānakhanda, P.528; Sarasvatīvilāsa, p.13, Virmitrodaya, Paribhāṣāprakāśa, p.18 attributes these verses to Prayogapārijāta and Madanaratna.
- 11. Ouoted in Viramitrodaya, Paribhāṣāprakāśa, P.18. नारदः पुलहो गार्ग्यः पुलस्त्यः शौनकः क्रतुः । बौधायनो जातुकर्णो विश्वामित्रः पितामहः ॥ व्यासः सनत्कुमारश्च शन्तुर्जनकस्तथा॥ जाबालिर्नाचिकेतश्च स्कन्दो लौगाक्षिकश्यपौ। व्याघ्रः कात्यायनश्चैव जातूकर्ण्यः कपिञ्जलः। बौधायनश्च काणादो विश्वामित्रस्तथैव च॥ पैठीनिसर्गोभिलश्चेत्युपस्मृतिविधायकाः॥ विस्छो नारदश्चैव सुमन्तुश्च पितामहः। विष्णुः काष्णाजिनिः सत्यव्रतो गार्ग्यश्च देवलः॥ जमदग्निर्भारद्वाजः पुलस्त्यः पुलहः क्रतुः॥ आत्रेयश्च गवेयश्च मरीचिर्वत्स एव च॥ पारस्करश्चर्ष्यभूङ्गो वैजवापस्तथैव च। इत्येते समृतिकर्तार एकविंशतिरीरिताः॥
- 12. Op. cit.. P.447.
- 13. Ibid, P.448.
- 14. A Vṛddha-Yājffavalkya verse quoted by Aparārka (on Yāj, III. 29-30) enjoins the same prāyaścitta for touching Cāṇḍālas, Pukkasas, Mlecchas, Bhillas and Pārasīkas-चाण्डाल-पुक्कस-म्लेच्छ-भिल्ल-पारसीकादिकम् । महापातकिनश्चैव स्पृष्ट्वा स्नायात्सचैलकम् ॥ From the context it seems that Mleccha here is not a general term for

outlandish people. It has often been used for foreigners in general. There are epigraphic and literary references for its use for Greeks, Scythians, Huns and Muslims. It is not possible to determine the people mentioned here. Pārasīka may provide a clue, but we cannot be sure about the people actually denoted by the name and the period of their entry into India after which the verse in question was written. The Achaemenids do not seem to be intended here. Possibly the reference is to the Indo-Parthians or more likely to the Indo-Sassanians. In the latter case Vrddha-Yājfavalkya will have to be placed in the sixth century or a little later.

- 15. Quoted by Jimūtavāhana, Dāyabhāga (1829), P.298.
- 16. On Yāj. I.4-5.
- 17. On *Yāj*, III.29-30.
- 18. On Yāj, III.1-2, 6, 19.
- 19. Op.cit., P.564.
- 20. Kane, *Op.cit.*, Pp. 507-8. Angiras is to be placed long before Viśvarūpa. He is later than Manu and Sātātapa, earlier than Sumantu, and belonged roughly to the times of Sankha. The late date of the *Prayogapārijāta* is not of any help for the present discussion.
- 21. Pulastya X.7.1.
- 22. Śrāddhatattva in Smrtitattva, I, p.189.
- 23. Page 501.
- 24. Pariśesakhanda, Śrāddhakalpa, p.152.
- 25. Krtyakalpataru, Śrāddha, P.176.
- 26. Viramitrodaya, Śrāddhaprakāśa, P.3.
- 27. Page 100.
- 28. Pulastya X.7.5-6.
- 29. Jivananda Vidyasagar, Bṛhat-Parāśara-saṃhitā, Part II, Pp.53-309.
- 30. L. Gopal, Aspects of history of agriculture in ancient India, Pp.21-29.
- 31. Kane, Op.cit., Vol.I, Pp.465-66.
- 32. Ibid.
- 33. Ibid., Vol, IV-Chronological table.
- 34. Op. cit., Pp.459-65.
- 35. Ibid., Pp.465-66.
- 36. The text claims to have 3300 verses.
- 37. Pulastya I.1.3.
- 38. Caturvargacintāmaņi, Parišesakhanda, Kālanirnaya, P.285; Purusārthacintāmaņi, P.268.
- 39. Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XXXII., P.276.
- 40. Op.cit,, I, p.488.

- 41. I.2.1-2.
- 42. On Yāj, III.57 (p.961).
- 43. Mokṣakāṇḍa, P.146.
- 44. On Yāj, III.205.
- 45. IX. 28-29.
- 46. Op.cit., Vol. I, P.457.
- 47. Kane, Op.cit., Pp. 451-52.
- 48, Ibid., P.517, f.n. 607.
- 49. See supra f.n.8.
- 50. Kane, Op.cit., I, Pp. 448-49, 458.
- 51. II.1.11.
- 52. II.1.4-10.
- 53. VII.2-3.
- 54. X.2.1.
- 55. X.7.8.
- 56. Evolution of Morals in the Epics, P.244.
- 57. Op. cit., Vol. V, P.893.
- 58. Studies in the Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, Pp.181-84.
- 59. Pulastya I.12-शाखानां विप्रकीर्णत्वात्पुरुषाणां प्रमादतः। नानाप्रकरणस्थत्वात्स्मृतेर्मूलं न लक्ष्यते॥
- 60. I.1.3.-धर्मेषु नियता ये च धर्मशास्त्रचिन्तकाः। वेदशास्त्रविदो ये च तेषां वचनमौषधम्॥
- 61. Gautama I.1-2; Manu, II.6.
- 62. Vasistha, I.4-6; Manu, II.6.
- 63. Yaj, I.7.
- 64. I.1.1.2- धर्मजसमयः प्रमाणं वेदाश्च।
- 65. Parāśara I.23 regards different Smṛtis to be authoritative for different ages. Bṛhaspati, Saṃskāra 13 decries Smṛtis opposed to Manu. Vyāsa (Quoted in Smṛticandrikā, I, P.17) requires comparative responsibility and majority view to be taken into consideration-तस्मादिरोधे धर्मस्य निश्चित्य गुरुलाधवम्। यतो भूयस्ततो विद्वान् कुर्याद्धमिविनिर्णयम्॥ The Nibandhas attempt this exercise with ingenuity and skilful reasoning. The conflict between Smṛtis and Sruti or Sadācāra has been covered.
- 66. See supra section II.6.
- 67. Dānakhanda, Pp.703-5.
- 68. Other texts also lay down the procedure to be followed. See *Matsyapurāna* ch.205. But, it is apparent that the formulation

is independent.

- 69. सर्वगुणविशिष्ट कृष्णाजिन ददामिः, कृष्णाजिन प्रतिगृह्णामि।
- 70. कृष्णाजिणं (न) द्विजश्रेष्ठ सिशरो गृष्टिभिर्युतं। ददामि प्रतिगृहीष्व प्रीयता धर्मराडिति॥
- 71. अदितिद्यौरिति जपेत् प्रणवेनादिना ततः। सप्रणवं मन्त्रं प्रतिग्रहाद्यन्तयोः प्रतिग्रहीता जपेत्॥
- 72. गोभूहिरण्यसंयुक्तं मार्गमेतइदाति यः। सर्वपापकर्माणि सायुज्यं ब्रह्मणो व्रजेत॥
- 73. II.1.3.
- 74. ZDMG, VOL. XXX, P.306.
- 75. JRAS, 1912, P.1039.
- 76. Kane, Op.cit., Vol.I, P.444.
- Dio's Roman History (Loeb Classical Library), Vol.III, Pp. 126-27; F.H. Colson, The Week (Cambridge, 1926); Sorton, History of Science, Pp. 76-77.
- 78. Kane, Op. cit., Vol. V, P.682.
- 79. J.F.Fleet, C.I.I., Vol. III, P. 89. It mentions Thursday as Suragurordivasa.
- 80. Kane, Op. cit., Vol. V, Pp.680-82.
- 81. E.Sachau, Alberuni's India, Vol.I, Pp.214-15; Cunningham, Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIV, Pp.1ff; S.Shamasastri, ABORI, Vol.IV, Pp.1-31; Kane, Op. cit., Vol.V, P.685.
- 82. XI.
- 83. Kane, Op.cit., II, Pp. 938-42.
- 84. Mbh., XIII. 141.89.
- 85. VIII.9.
- 86. IV.11.
- 87. Ouoted by Aparārka, P.952.
- 88. Ch.161, 18.
- 89. III.3.5.
- 90. III.6-24.
- 91. VIII.4.6.
- 92. III.7.16,19.
- 93. III.12.
- 94. III.22.
- 95. VIII. 6-24.
- 96. VIII.7,19.
- 97. II.3.3-4.
- 98. II.1.6,7,9.
- 99. History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol.II, P.720.
- 100. Early History of Vaisnava Sect. P.63.

- 101. I.3. 26- अवतारा ह्यसंख्येया हरेः स्त्वनिधेर्द्विजाः।
- 102. Mbh., XII. 326-337; III.256.49-72; Bhāgavatapurāṇa, I.3; II.7; VI.8.
- 103. Ramāyaṇa, II.109.34- यथा हि चोरः स तथाहि बुद्धस्तथागतं नास्तिकमत्र विद्धि। See K.K. Gopal. "Nāradapurāṇa on Buddhālaya", Purāṇam, XXVI (1984), Pp. 21-32.
- 104. Schrader, Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā, P.48; D. C. Sircar, "Early History of Vaiṣṇavism" in The Cultural Heritage of India, Vol. IV, Pp. 127-29. He is one of the earliest Brahmanical deities to be represented in art-S.B.Singh. Brahmanical Icons in Northern India, P.92.
- 105. (Gita Press) XII. 339.103-4-रामो दाशरियश्चैव सात्वतः किल्करेव च। See infra f.n.127.
- 106. See J.N. Banerjea, Puranic and Tantric Religion, Pp. 45ff.
- 107. I.3.23. See also VI. 8.18.
- 108. X.145-46.
- 109. IV.2. See also Memoir of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 26, P.5 for an eighth century inscription from Mamallapuram containing this verse. Ksemendra in his Daśāvatāracarita follows it.
- 110. We do not have any epigraphic reference to the worship of Balarāma in the Gupta period.
- 111. Op. cit., P.135.
- 112. Mbh., XII. 337.36- वाराहं नारसिंहं च वामनं मानुषं तथा।
- 113. *Mbh.*, XII. 326.71-92.
- 114. Mbh. (Gita Press), XII.339.104 (mentions him simply as Rāma). See infra f.n. 127. Matsyapurāņa, XLVII. 237-48; Viṣṇupurāṇa, XCVIII.71-104.
- 115. X.146-नार्चयेद्भार्गवं बुद्धं सर्वत्रापि च कर्मसु।
- 116. Vaisnavism, Saivism and minor religious systems, p.66.
- 117. According to Sita Ram Chaturvedi, Vaisnava Dharma (in Hindi), P.55 the recognition of Rāma as an avatāra can be traced back to the first century B.C.
- 118. X. 73. See also I.10.
- 119. Verse 12- वन्दैः पुसा रघुपतिपदैरङ्कितं मेखलासु। Verse 1- जनकतनयास्नानपुण्योदकेषु।
- 120. LVIII. See also Visnudharmottarapurāna, III.85.62-63.
- 121. XII. 326.71-92. But Rāma does not figure in *Mbh.*, III. 256. 49-72 (it mentions only Varāha, Nṛṣiṃha, Vāmana and Kṛṣṇa).
- 122. It is generally believed that the divinty of Rāma is expressed only in Bālakāṇḍa and Uttarakāṇḍa which seem to have been later additions to the text.

- 123. Matsyapurāna, XLVII. 237-48; Vāyupurāna, XCVIII. 71-104.
- 124. Harivaṃśa, I.41; Garuḍapurāṇa, I.202. In Gitā X.21 Kṛṣṇa claims his identification with Rāma, the foremost among wielders of weapon.
- 125. See Supra f.n. 106.
- 126. I.3.20, 22,23.
- 127. Mbh (Gita Press), XII. 339.103-4-वराहो नारसिंहश्च वामनो राम एव च। रामो दाशरथिश्चैव सात्वतः किल्करेव च॥ The Critical edition does not accept the verse but places it as an insertion after XII.326.94 ab. Also Mbh (Gita Press), XII. 339, verse no. 2 between 76 and 77- रामो रामश्च रामश्च। The Critical edition regards these verses between 76 and 77 as later insertions after its XII. 326. 71.
- 128. Mbh., III.256.47-सृज्यते ब्रह्मामूर्तिस्तु रक्षते पौरुषी तनुः। रौद्रीभावेन शमयेत्तिग्रोऽवस्थाः प्रजापतेः॥ Hopkins, Epic Mythology, P. 231 considers it to be a late passage, as it is the solitary passage about Trimūrti in the Mahābhārata.
- 129. S.Bhattacharya, Indian Theogony, P.356.
- 130. Ibid., P.357.
- 131. X.16- नमो विश्वसृजे पूर्व विश्व तदनु बिभ्रते। अथ विश्वस्य सहर्त्रे तुभ्यं त्रेधास्थितात्मने॥
- 132. II.4- नमस्त्रिमूर्तये तुभ्यं प्राक् सृष्टेः केवलमात्मने। गुणत्रयविभागाय पश्चाद् भेदमुपेयुषे॥
- 133. II.1.7.
- 134. II.1.8.
- 135. II.1.10.
- 136. II.4.3.
- 137. VII.2.5.
- 138. VII.2.
- 139. VII.3.
- 140. II.1.11.
- 141. Op.cit., Vol. IV, P.558, f.n.1253.
- 142. D.R.Patil, Cultural History of Vāyupurāna, P.334.
- 143. P.V.Kane, Op. cit., P.554.
- 144. Gautama, XIX.14; Vasiṣṭha, XXII.12-सर्वे शिलोच्चयाः सर्वाः सवन्त्यः पुण्या हृदास्तीर्थान्यृषिनिवासा गोष्ठपरिस्कन्दा इति देशाः। Baudhāyana, III.10.12 substitutes oनिवासा गोष्ठo.
- 145. In the Viṣṇudharmasūtra, II.16-17 tirthānusaraṇa is included in the list of sāmānyadharma. But, this Dharmasūtra, also known as a

- Smṛti, is the latest among the Dharmasūtras and is generally dated to 300 B.C.-100 A.D.
- 146. Op. cit., P.561.
- 147. VIII.6.281-सङ्गश्चे च नदीनाम्. The Vājasaneya Saṃhitā. XXVI.15 reads saṅgame for saṅgathe.
- 148. Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, XXV.10.15; Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra, XXIV.5-6.
- 149. Tirthacintāmaņi of Vācaspati, P.47; Tristhalisetu of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, P.3-सितासिते सरिते यत्र संगते तत्राप्लुतासो दिवमुत्पतन्ति।
- 150.. II.54.6.
- 151. P.V.Kane, Op.cit., P.597.
- 152. R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalker, The Vedic Age, P.246; M. L. Bhargava, The Geography of Rgvedic India, Pp.40-41.
- 153. R.V., X 75.5-6.
- 154. R.V., VI.45.31-उरुः कक्षो न गाङ्ग्यः।
- 155. VIII.92- तेन चेदविवादस्ते मा गंडूां मा कुरून्ममः।
- 156. X.31-स्रोतसामस्मि जाह्नवी।
- 157. Kane, Op. cit., Pp.586-89.
- 158. II.9-समुद्रो वा एष सर्वहरो यदोहारात्रे तस्य हैते अगाधे तीर्थे यत्सन्ध्ये तद्यथा अगाधाम्यां तीर्थाभ्यां समुद्रमतीयात्ताट्टक् तत्।
- 159. Vāyu, 77.117- समुद्रगाः समुद्राश्च सर्वे पुण्याः समन्ततः। Kūrma, II.37.49-50 adds another line नद्यः समुद्रगाः पुण्याः समुद्रश्च विशेषतः।
- 160. Uttara, 58.19 राजा समस्ततीर्थाना सागरः सरिता पतिः।
- 161. VIII.2, 3, 8, 9, 10 (pāṣaṇḍāḥ), 16.
- 162. See Aśoka's Rock Edict V, VII, XII, XIII; Pillar Edict VI, VIIpāṣanda as a general term for a religious sect.
- 163. S.Soni, "Place of Sila in Buddhism", Mahabodhi, LXXIII, Pp.137 f; G.S.P. Mishra, The Age of Vinaya, Pp.76 f.
- 164. See supra section III.1 and 2.

Chapter 4

The Pulastya-upasmrti

In his monumental work *History of Dharmaśātra*¹, Kane recognises Pulastya as an author of a *Smṛti*. He has discussed the quotations from the *Pulastyasmṛti* occurring in later texts, but does not take any notice of a published *Pulastyasmṛti*. The *Dharmaśāstrasangraha*, edited by Pandit Mahadeva Shastri Amarpurkar² contains twenty-eight *Smṛtis*, of which the *Pulastyasmṛti* is one. The *Smṛtisandarbha*, which aims at bringing together all available *Smṛti* texts, also prints the *Pulastyasmṛti*. Though, in most cases, the publisher of the *Smṛtisandarbha* adopts the *Smṛti* text as published elsewhere, he prints the *Pulastyasmṛti* on the basis of a manuscript available in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. Evidently he does not borrow the text of the *Pulastyasmṛti* from the *Dharmaśāstrasangraha*.

1. Content

The published Pulastyasmrti has twenty-nine verses. To distinguish it from the earlier Pulastyasmrti, surviving in the form of quotations, we designate it as the Pulastya-upasmrti. The introductory verse in the printed text says that in Kuruksetra the sages enquired from Pulastya about the different types (prakāra) of dharma. In his reply Pulastya refers to the five forms (pañcadhā) of dharma. In verse 3 these are stated to be varnadharma, āśramadharma, varnāśramadharma, gunadharma and naimittikadharma. Verse 4 explains varnadharma as referring to the rules relating to the varnas, to wit, the upanayana of the first three varnas. The āśramadharma, or the provisions concerning the āśramas, are illustrated by the topics of bhiksā (begging) and pinda (oblation to the dead) (verse 5). The definition and explanation of varnāśramadharma are missing4. Verse 6 defines naimittikadharma as the rules which are laid down for both the varnas and the āśramas together and mentions as example the rules about prāyaścitta. Verse

7 enumerates the four āśramas: brahmacāri, grhastha, vāṇaprastha and bhikṣuka. 5 It mentions rājadharma as the fifth form of dharma. There is no explanation of guṇadharma here. Evidently rājadharma has been mentioned here in place of guṇadharma. Verse 8 refers to the general rules (sādhāraṇa dharma) for the varṇas and the four āśramas 6.

Verses 9 to 11 enumerate the duties of the four *varṇas*, *ijyā* (sacrifice), *adhyayana* (study) and *dāna* (gift) are mentioned as the duties common (*sāmānya dharma*) to the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas. Verse 10 lays down the *ājīvana* (source of livelihood): for Brāhmaṇas ⁷ *yājana* (performing sacrifice for others) and *adhyāpana* (teaching), for Kṣatriyas providing protection to people, and for Vaiśyas cattle-rearing and agriculture. Serving (*suśrūṣā*) the *dvijas* in a descending order is mentioned as the duty of Sūdras. The occupations (*vrtti*) open for a Sūdra are serving (*sevā*) the *dvijas* and crafts (*kārukarma*).

Verses 12 to 21 deal with the duties of the four āśramas: brahmacārins (12-14), grhamedhins (15-16); vanavāsins (17-18) and parivrāts (19-21).

Verse 22 says that ahimsā (non-injury to others), satyavāda (truth-speaking), satya (honesty),8 śauca, (purity), dayā (compassion) and ksamā (forbearance) are the general duties (sāmānya dharma) alike for all the four varnas and the ascetics. Verse 23 says that it is the duty of all the varnas and the ascetics 9 to acquire the knowledge of the self (svajñāna). In this context the text mentions adrstārtha, drstārtha, ubhayārtha and nyāyamūla (23b to 24a), which refer to the different types of meaning to be given to provisions in the Smrtis. Two lines, which possibly were dropped by carelessness, explained drstartha and adrstartha. The line illustrating ubhayārtha is slightly distorted (24b). Line 25a explains $ny\bar{a}yam\bar{u}la$. The text says that dharma is to be known from the Veda and Smrtis (25b) and that the Smrtis (anuvāka) lay down what is uttered in the Sruti. The eminent meaning is specified specially in the Brāhmanas and others (26). Verse 27 says that the meritorious meaning is to be specially seen. This meaning is to be followed by one who desires to have religious merit.

Verse 28, in a concluding strain, says that *dharma*, in its five forms, which is the cause of *śreyas* (spiritual merit) and *abhyudaya*

(worldly prosperity), has been pronounced. It is to be duly followed by a person seeking meritorious results.

Verse 29 prescribes the period of impurity caused by the death of a daughter ¹⁰.

2. Comparison with Bhavisyapurana and Agnipurana

As these topics are covered in other *Smrtis* also, we may find parallels in them. But, considering the emphasis on certain points, the specific details about them and the expression and style, it will be a rewarding venture to compare the verses of the *Pulastya-upasmrti* with the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* (hereinafter abbreviated as Bh. P.) I. 181 and *Agnipurāṇa* (abbreviated as A. P.) Ch. 166. These two *Purāṇas* also deal with the fivefold *dharma* ¹¹ and the nature of the *Smrti* injunctions and their interpretation.

The introductory portions in the three sources differ because they prepare the setting according to the requirements of their cases. In Bh. P. Sumantu, requested by Satānīka, introduces the dialogue between Aruna and Bhāskara or Āditya 12. In A. P. Puskara is the narrator. In Bh. P. the introductory portion is the longest (nine verses). A. P. has just one line. Pulastya introduces the subject in two verses. Of these the narrative in Bh. P. is the fullest and the most logical. Satānīka solicits from Sumantu a summarised account of five forms of dharma. For the details Sumantu refers to the dialogue between Aruna and Bhāskara. Aruna asks Bhāskara about smrtidharma. Bhāskara describes smrtidharma to be rooted in the Vedas and then explains the meaning of the two terms smrti and dharma. In this connection he describes dharma to be of five kinds. Anūru (Aruna) expresses his interest in further details of the fivefold dharma. From what follows in the three sources it is clear that, though the main emphasis was on the fivefold dharma, the subject was equated with smrtidharma and hence the narrative contained a reference to the validity of Smrti injunctions and their different possible interpretations. In this respect Bh. P. alone offers the proper introduction which correctly provides the background for the subsequent fuller treatment of the concerned topics.

When we compare the verses in the introductory portions of the three sources, we find that $1b^{13}$ and $2b^{14}$ of Pulastya are parallel to $1a^{15}$ and $2a^{16}$ of Bh.P.

On the five forms of dharma Bh.P. has six verses (10 to 15), A.P. has eight lines (1b to 5a) and Pulastya has twenty verses (3 to 22). In a verse common to Bh.P. (10) and Pulastya (3), the five forms of dharma are listed as varnadharma, āśramadharma, varnāśramadharma, gunadharma and naimittikadharma17. There is nothing parallel to it in the A. P. The following verse defining varnadharma occurs in all the three sources (Bh.P. 11; A.P.1b-2a; Pulastya 4). Except for a minor variation in the first half of the first line 18, A.P. and Pulastya have the same reading. The second line in Bh.P. does not have any relevance for varnadharma It is apparently connected with the description of āśramadharma19. As we suggest below in the restoration in the case of the description of varnāśramadharma and naimittikadharma in A. P. and Pulastya, we find a parallel mistake on the part of the scribe of Bh.P. in defining varnadharma and āśramadharma. He seems to have combined the first line of the verse defining varnadharma with the second line explaining āśramadharma²⁰. This is supported by the quotation from Bh.P. occurring in the commentaries of Kullūka and Manirāma. These sources give the second line of the verse on varnadharma as follows:

Varnadharmah sa uktastu yathopanayanam nrpa.

The next verse defines āśramadharma. The reading in A.P. (2b-3a) and Pulastya (5) is identical ²¹. The first line of the parallel verse in Bh.P. seems to have been subsequently dropped on account of the carelessness of the copyist. Kullūka and Manirāma quote its first line as follows:

Yastvāśramam samāśritya adhikārah pravartate.

The verse defining varnāśramadharma occurs only in Bh.P. (12) ²². The corresponding verse in A.P. (3b-4a) and Pulastya (6) defines nimittadharma²³. This possibly is due to a mistake on the part of the copyist, who dropped the second line of the verse defining varnāśramadharma and the first line of the verse defining nimittadharma and fused the remaining lines to form the verse in question. Bh.P. has two verses defining naimittikadharma²⁴. The verse defining naimittikadharma in A.P. and Pulastya possibly had originally combined the first and the fourth line of these two verses ²⁵. We may, thus, restore the original verse defining varnāśramadharma in A.P. and Pulastya by combining A.P.3b

(= Pulastya 6a) with Bh.P. 12b 26.

Gunadharma has been defined only in Bh.P.(13). The corresponding verse in A.P. (4b-5a) and Pulastya (7) explains aśramadharma a second time by enumerating the four aśramas x. The second part of the second line (5a) in A.P. reads dharmah syāt pañcadhā parah. This leaves a lacuna in the text and omits a reference to the gunadharma. The corresponding reading in Pulastya is rājadharmastu pañcamah. This is happier as it covers the fifth, the gunadharma. The reference to rājadharma in place of gunadharma seems to be based on Bh.P. which illustrates gunadharma as the protection of the subject people by the anointed king x.

Verses 8 to 21 in Pulastya are without any parallel in the other two texts. After referring to the classification of varṇas and āśramas alike into four, it goes on to describe separately the duties of the individual varṇas. Likewise, Pulastya (22) alone describes sāmānya dharma as applying to the people of the four varṇas and the āśramas (lingins). These are ahiṃsā, satyavāda, satya, śauca, dayā and ksamā ²⁹.

Verses 23 to 27 in Pulastya have their parallel in A.P. 5b-9a and Bh.P. 16-32. In A.P. it has an abrupt beginning without any perceptible connection with the preceding verses. Pulastva tries to forge a connection by saying that for all the varnas and lingins realisation in their heart of the knowledge of self (svajñāna) is the dharma (23a). It then goes on to enumerate the four as adrstartha, drstārtha, ubhayārtha and nyāyamūla (23b-24a). It does not mention the context to which these four refer, nor does it explain the meaning of the terms. It says that vyavahāra and dandadhārana are ubhayārtha (both drstārtha and adrstārtha) and that if two meanings have equal application, there is vikalpa (option) which is declared to be nyāyamūla (rooted in nyāya) 30. In A.P. it is stated that drstartha has been illustrated in describing the sadgunya; according to the school of Manu, with reference to mantra, yaga etc. the adrstartha is of three types (5b-6a). It then reproduces the two lines about ubhayārtha and nyāyamūla31. It can be easily seen that, whereas lines 23b-24a of Pulastya are missing in A.P., Pulastya has dropped lines 5b-6a of A.P. Possibly the original of these two texts had six lines, of which a set of two different lines have been dropped in each case on account of the carelessness of the scribe.

We can understand the real significance of these four (originally six) lines in Pulastya and A.P., if we compare them with the corresponding lines in Bh.P. This third text provides the necessary connecting link, background and details for understanding the other texts. After describing the fivefold dharma. Bh.P. says that dharma is to be determined in four ways (16). It lays down the procedure to be followed if the dharma clashes with śāstras. vyavasthā and smrtis or if there is inner contradiction (17-20). The śāstras are generally taken to be of two types: prohibitive and preceptive (nisedhavidhirūpam)(21). The smrtis are arranged into five types, though sometimes they are said to be of three, four, two, one or many types. The five types of smrtis are drstartha, adrstartha or ubhayārtha, nyāyamūla and anuvādasmrti. Verse 23 mentions only four, omitting nvāvamūla. But. Aruna. when requesting Aditva to explain the different types of smrtis. mentions all the five types (24-26).

A comparison of the explanation of these terms given by Aditva in Bh.P. with those occurring in Pulastya and A.P. leaves no doubt that, in their efforts to summarise the explanations, the authors of A.P. and Pulastya have committed mistakes and caused confusion. Thus, the one-line explanation of drstartha in A.P.32 is evidently based on the two verses in Bh.P. (27-28)33. Bh.P. in verse 29, on the authority of Manu, provides a very clear illustration of the adrstārtha smrti 34. In its cryptic one-line account of adrstārtha35 A.P. clearly had Bh.P. verse in view, because it also specifically refers to the opinion of the school of Manu. The comparison of the lines dealing with ubhayārtha and nyāyamūla in the three texts is interesting. Bh.P. 30a illustrates ubhayārtha (earlier in the introductory portions the term used is drstādrsta) by the provision to use a danda of palāśa. A.P. 6a and Pulastya 24b are evidently based on Bh.P., but, in an effort to introduce change and summarise, they have sacrificed the intelligibility of the original verses. This defect is more pronounced in the case of Pulastya 24b.

As regards the *nyāyamūla* type the best reading occurs in Pulastya 25a.³⁶ The reading in A.P. 7a³⁷ is similar, except for the reading *yāgamūlaḥ* in place of *nyāyamūlaḥ* ³⁸. The change can be explained with the help of Bh.P. 30b which is quite intelligible and provides an illustration of option (*vikalpa*) in the case of conflicting

provisions (virodha). It does not contain a reference to the term for the fourth ($ny\bar{a}yam\bar{u}la$). Possibly a line containing the name has been inadvertently dropped. It would seem that the author of A.P. did not copy the line from Pulastya. He had with him Bh.P. which employs the word $y\bar{a}go$ in its illustration, and used it in place of $ny\bar{a}ya$.

The definition of anuvādinī smṛti is to be found only in Bh.P. 31. A.P. 7b-9a and Pulastya 25b-27 do not contain any such definition. They instead remark that dharma is prescribed in both the Vedas and the smṛtis; according to the school of Manu the smṛtis provide the translation (anuvāda) for the purpose of their being implemented ³⁹. The third line in A.P. and Pulastya yields two slightly differing meanings. According to A.P. the translation specially brings out the eminent meaning or the specifying meaning ⁴⁰, whereas, according to Pulastya, the eminent meaning is specified specially in the Brāhmaṇas and others ⁴¹. The last line says that according to the school of Manu this meritorious meaning is to be partially seen ⁴². A.P. and Pulastya do not seem to have based their lines on the verse in Bh.P. The common source, from which the two derived information, possibly had these four lines about the significance of the smṛtis and their connection with the Vedas.

Pulastya 27b adds yet another line which says that meaning should be followed by one who desires to have religious merit. Such a line is not found in the other two texts.

A.P. does not stop with the verses on the *Smrtis* and their meaning. It goes on to enumerate the forty-eight sacraments (*saṃskāras*), through which a person attains the Brahmaloka (9b-16a). The other two texts do not refer to the sacraments.

At the end both Bh.P. 32 and Pulastya 27 have a verse which makes a concluding reference to the main topics covered in the preceding verses. Bh.P. refers to the summarised description of *dharma* and the definitions under it and ends with saying that Ravi narrated it thus⁴³. Suiting its narrower scope Pulastya refers to fivefold *dharma*, which is the cause of spiritual merit and material prosperity, and urges people, who aspire for merit, to duly follow it ⁴⁴. This verse in Pulastya uses the expression *śreyobhyudayahetuka* to refer to the merit caused by the fivefold *dharma*. It is interesting to note that Bh.P. in verse 7 describes the fivefold *dharma*

to be śreyobhyudayalakṣaṇa and paraphrases the idea in verse 8. The influence of Bh.P. is thus visible.

Verse 29 of Pulastya does not occur in the other two texts. It does not have any direct connection with the topics covered in the three texts. It appears in the text abruptly, without any justification.

Thus, we see that though the three texts largely cover the same ground and have much in common in the treatment of the two main themes of the fivefold *dharma* and the different interpretations of the *Smrti* injunctions, it cannot be established that one copies from another. In regard to the two themes Pulastya and A.P. are often in close agreement, though there are also marked differences in reading and significant omissions. Instead of labelling one as the borrower, it will be better to describe both as drawing upon the same common source.

When compared with these two, Bh.P. has a better form and a fuller narrative. In it the scheme of the chapter is more clearly pronounced and implemented; both the themes have a fuller and more proper introduction. The connecting link in the two parts of the narrative has also been effectively established. The fuller details about different points under the two themes stand in sharp contrast with the cryptic and often unintelligible verses in the other two sources. One can easily see in the other two sources an effort to bring about brevity and summarise the details. If Bh.P. is not the original, on which the other two drew, it was very near the original in form and spirit. The differences, often identical, which the other two have with Bh.P. version, suggest that Bh.P. was not the original. On the contrary it shows that it borrowed the details about the two themes from some other source. Its chapter begins as a dialogue between Satānīka and Sumantu, but the details about the two themes are given in the course of the dialogue between Aditya and Aruna. The closing verse also refers to the provisions as having been laid down by Ravi (Aditya). Evidently the author of Bh.P. borrowed these portions from some other source. We are not in a position to trace the text which contained Ravi's version of the fivefold dharma. This account possibly circulated for a long time before being recorded in Bh.P.

3. Date

We can infer that *Pulastya-upasmrti* was not far removed from the period of Chapter 166 of A.P. and possibly followed the composition of Bh.P. I, Chapter 181. The only other indication about the date is the reference to the views of the school of Manu (Pulastya 26, 27). The possibility that the school of Manu had a very early existence is not helpful in narrowing the range of date for the composition of Pulastya.

R.C. Hazra 45 who has made a special study of the *Smrti* material in the *Purāṇas*, places the *Smrti* chapters, which are original to the *Agnipurāṇa*, in the 9th century. Hazra remarks that there may be a few more chapters of the second type, but adds that they cannot be separated. The chapter under study cannot be said to have been completely borrowed from another source, though it has many similarities with the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* and the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. According to Hazra 46 *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* I, Chapter 181 is to be dated not earlier than A.D. 500 and not later than A.D. 1075. The *Pulastya-upasmṛti*, which belongs roughly to the period of the *Agnipurāṇa* chapter, as the two seem to draw upon the same source, and was possibly a little later than the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* chapter, may be dated around A.D. 650-700.

4. Pulastya-upasmṛti distinct from Pulastyasmṛti

In determining the date of the composition of the *Pulastya-upasmrti* we may examine the significance of its verse 29 ⁴⁷. As we have pointed out earlier, it is not connected with the two main themes of the text and does not occur in the parallel portions of the *Agnipurāṇa* and *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. Possibly it did not form a part of the original text. The editor of the *Pulastya-upasmrti* in the Gurumandala series (*Smrtisandarbha*) realised it and has described it as an interpolation (*prakṣipta*). But, as the verse appears both in the *Dharmaśāstrasangraha* and *Smrtisandarbha* editions, which evidently were based on two different manuscripts of the text, it may be suggested that the verse in question was added at a very early stage of the copying of the manuscripts of the text. We find that Aparārka ⁴⁸ and Kamalākarabhaṭṭa ⁴⁹ reproduce the verse as a quotation from Pulastya. An early copyist of the manuscript of the *Pulastya-upasmrti*, aware of the quotation in the writings of Aparārka and

Kamalākarabhaṭṭa, possibly deemed iṭ proper to suffix the verse to the text of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti*. But, then we will have to explain why the copyist selected only one verse to the exclusion of other verses of Pulastya, many of which are quoted by Aparārka and Kamalākrabhaṭṭa as well. Admittedly, there is no reasonable explanation of this particular verse being suffixed to the text of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti*. The copyist, who inserted this verse, evidently belonged to a period later than that of Aparārka, or even after that of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa.

We may consider another possible explanation of the occurrence of the particular verse. It seems from the quotations in medieval commentaries and digests that the original *Pulastyasmrti* was by no means a small text. It possibly covered many topics that fall within the scope of a *Smrti*. The portion dealing with the fivefold *dharma* and the interpretation of *Smrti* injunctions formed a compact chapter and was possibly copied and preserved as a separate unit. At a later stage a copyist tried to preserve other surviving verses, but without achieving any lasting success. Whereas the other verses could not stick to the separate unit on *dharma* and *smrtis*, the verse in question somehow had a charmed survival.

If all the surviving quotations and the printed *Pulastya-upasmrti* formed part of an earlier original *Smrti*, then the date of the original *Smrti*, determined on the basis of the quotations, will hold good for the printed text also. The occurrence in the printed text of the verse under reference would suggest for it a date quite sometime before Aparārka. On the basis of the gradual acceptance of Pulastya as a *Smrti* writer and the date of the texts containing quotations from Pulastya, we have suggested ⁵⁰ the time bracket A.D. 300-500 for the original *Pulastyasmrti*. This, then, will become the date for the printed text also.

Though there is nothing inherently improbable in it, the printed text does not appear to have formed part of the original text. It is to be noted that none of the verses quoted from the original *Pulastyasmrti* in the later commentaries and digests occurs in the printed text ⁵¹.

If we treat the published *Smrti* to be a separate text prepared later, we will have to explain how the name *Pulastyasmrti*, used for the earlier *Smrti*, came to be applied to it also. We will have to find a cogent explanation for the circulation of two separate texts under

the same name. It is well known that to distinguish two *Smrtis*, attributed to the same ancient sage, one is prefixed with the adjective *vrddha*, *brhad* or *laghu*. On this analogy it will be argued that our printed text, if it was composed later, should have been appropriately named as *Vrddha* - or *Brhat-Pulastyasmrti*.

But the objection is not unsurmountable. Though it is correct that the names of the Smrtis were differentiated in the manner indicated above, it was not imperative and was not done in all cases. We have other examples of two or more *Smrti* texts circulating under the name of a common ancient sage as their author. One such name is that of Uśanas. There are two separate *Smrti* texts under his name⁵². S.C. Banerji has published a third known from manuscripts in the Deccan College collection⁵³. The numerous verses attributed to Ušanas, which have survived in medieval commentaries and digests, indicate the possible existence of a fourth *Smrti* under his name.

Thus, we may infer that the published *Pulastya-upasmṛti* was composed not along with or as part of the original *Pulastyasmṛti*, but some time after it.

5. Importance of the Pulastya-upasmṛti

The contents of this *Smrti* will also suit the history of the development of *Smrti* literature. As we have seen above, the two themes of the present *Pulastya-upasmrti* are: a description of the fivefold *dharma* and a reference to the nature of the authority of *Smrtis* and the different types of meaning given by them.

(a) Fivefold dharma. This Smrti is unique in describing the fivefold dharma. None of the earlier Smrtis mentions such a classification of dharma, 54 though they cover in their own way some or all of the different points connected with the fivefold dharma. Leaving the Pulastya-upasmrti, one of the earliest references to the fivefold classification of dharma 55 is found in Medhātithi's commentary 56. This is followed by other commentators of Manu, such as Govindarāja and Kullūka. Haradatta, in his commentary on the Gautama-dharmasūtra 57, also mentions the fivefold classification. The Mitākṣarās refers to a sixfold classification of dharma, adding sādhāraṇadharma as the sixth. The sixfold

classification is mentioned by Hemādri ⁵⁹, but without enumerating them. Though Pulastya does not enumerate six types of *dharma*, in verse 22 he lists the qualities under sāmānya-dharma, which is the same as the sādhārana dharma, the sixth in the Mitākṣarc classification of dharma. On the basis of the reference to the fivefold dharma, we may place Pulastya-upasmṛti in the class of later Smṛtis, nearer in time and spirit to the phase of commentaries and digests.

It is to be noted that Medhātithi does not attribute the fivefold classification to any particular Smrti. He refers to the expounders of Smrti (Smrti-vivaranakāras) as propounding them. Vijfīāneśvara also is silent about the authority for the sixfold classification. Hemādri 60, Candeśvara 61, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda quote verses from the Bhavisyapurāna which deal with the different types of dharma. The Smrticandrikā 62 reproduces some of these verses as from Sumantu. We do not have any Smrti under the name of Sumantu containing these verses. Devannabhatta is apparently wrong in attributing the verses to Sumantu. The chapter in the Bhavisvapurāna which contains these verses has the wider structure of interlocution between Sumantu and Satānīka. For this reason Davannabhatta ascribes the verses to Sumantu and not to the Bhavisyapurāna. Manirāma mentions the verses as occurring in the Visnupurāna. This is opposed to the testimony of other commentators, such as Kullūka and Rāghavānanda. Moreover, the verses are not traceable in the extant Visnupurāna. Unless it is suggested that the verses did occur in the original Visnupurāna as well, but were dropped in course of time, we will have to take the attribution of the verses to the Visnupurāna to be misconceived.

It is strange that the medieval commentaries and digests chose to quote the verses as from the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* and not from the *Pulastyasmṛti*. It is well known that the *Purāṇas* also came to acquire a status parallel to the *Smṛti* texts and their views and provisions were quoted with distinct respect. In some cases the commentaries and digests have exercised their option in favour of a *Purāṇa* text, though they had identical statements in some *Smṛtis* as well. In the present case an additional consideration could have been the minor and insignificant nature of the *Pulastyasmṛti*. The text was possibly not in wide circulation. As a later *Smṛti* text it does not seem

possibly not in wide circulation. As a later *Smṛti* text it does not seem to have acquired general popularity. When contrasted with it the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* seems to have acquired a profound respect as a text dealing with *dharmaśāstra* material. This is clear from the numerous quotations from the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* which have survived in commentaries and digests.

The Pulastya-upasmrti

It is not to be inferred that the authors of the medieval commentaries and digests were ignorant about the occurrence of the verses on fivefold *dharma* in the *Pulastya-upasmṛti*. The earlier ones do not quote the verses, nor do they mention the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. Medhātithi, by referring to the authority of the expounders of *Smṛti*, shows that he borrowed his fivefold classification from a *Smṛti* text and not a *Purāṇa*. As the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* gained in prestige, it eclipsed the authority of the minor text, *Pulastya-upasmṛti*, and quotations from it came to replace the description and explanation of the fivefold *dharma*. If this point has any value as an indication of the date of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* in relation to the chapter in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, we may infer that both belonged roughly to the same period and further that the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* has a case for being placed a little earlier than the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* chapter.

- (b) Authority of the Smṛtis The second theme of the present text, namely the nature of the authority of the Smṛtis and the different types of meaning assigned to their provisions, is not separate and distinct. It is intrinsically connected with the first theme. The two themes taken together form a unity of purpose for the text. Interpreted in this manner, the text will have one single theme, namely the smārtadharma. The first part of the Pulastya-upasmṛti describes the different parts of the smārtadharma. Its second part deals with the nature of the authority enjoyed by the Smṛtis and the different types of meaning which they yield. The planning of the chapter in the Bhaviṣyapurāna brings out this point very clearly. Line 1b in the Pulastya-upasmṛti also makes a pointed reference to the types of dharma which have been received as smārta.
- (c) Smartadharma as theme In ancient texts dharma is generally divided into śrauta and smārta 63, though sometimes on the basis of

the three sources of dharma (śruti, smrti and śiṣṭācāra), it is divided into three, namely śrauta, smārta and śiṣṭācāra 64 . The smārtadharma is derivatively explained as that which is dealt with by the Smrtis (smrtiśāstrāgata) 65 and is said to be concerned with the ācāra (conduct) of the varnas and āśramas and to contain yamas and niyamas. 66

Thus, the significance of the present text in the class of *Smrti* literature is that it is the first to take up the well defined task of describing *smārtadharma* (as contrasted with the *śrautadharma*) in its five forms, and also of emphasising the authoritative character of the *Smrtis* and their provisions.

References

- 1. Vol. I, pp. 516-17.
- Jñāna Darpan Press, Bombay. Saka Era 1805 (1883 A. D.) It has been reprinted, with introductory notes by Vachaspati Upadhyaya, Navrang, New Delhi 1982. The *Pulastyasmṛti* occurs in vol. II. Hereinafter it is mentioned as Amarpurakar edition.
- 3. Gurumandal series, no. LX. Published by Mansukh Rai More, Calcutta 1953, vol. IV, pp.2134-36. We refer to it as Gurumandal version.
- 4. Varṇāśramadharma relates to rules in which both varṇas and āśramas are taken into consideration. Possibly the first line of verse 6 introduced varṇāśramadharma. As it contained the word nimittena, an ignorant scribe took it to be connected with the definition of naimittikadharma and dropped the second line of the verse defining varṇāśramadharma and the first line of the following verse introducing naimittikadharma. Further, it is not unlikely that verse 8 aimed at explaining varṇāśramadharma.
- 5. Evidently here a few lines are missing. In verse 5 āśramadharma has already been defined -uktā (sic.) āśramadharmastu. Hence the expression uktā āśramadharmastu in the second line of verse 7 is redundant. Further, there is no parallel enumeration of the four varnas.
- 6. Possibly verse 8 preceded verse 7.
- 7. The original verse does not use any word for Brāhmaṇas.
- 8. The use of the two expressions *satyavāda* and *satya* together implies a difference between the two. Hence *satya* may mean honesty, sincerity, truthfulness, faithfulness, virtue, uprightness.
- 9. Varnilingin signifies a hypocritical person who wears the marks or badges of or is disguised as a religious student. The expression varnilinginām here is to be taken to signify varninām linginānca of verse 22. Varninām, then, will refer to persons of the four varnas and linginām, which means a religious student, a Brāhmana ascetic, will refer to persons of the four āśramas.
- 10. Gurumandal edition reads pradātā yām for pradattāyām.
- 11. The Agnipurāna gives varnadharmādikathanam as the title of the chapter. In the Gurumandal edition (Smṛtisandarbha) of the Pulastyasmṛti its theme is mentioned as varnāśramadharmavarnanam.
- 12. The Smrtisandarbha (vol. IV, pp. 2119-33) publishes the Arunasmrti, which is in the form of a dialogue between Aruna and Aditya. It has only Chapter I dealing with pratigraha and prāyaścitta. If it dealt with other topics, including varnadharma and other forms of dharma, it

- cannot be ascertained.
- 13. तांश्च धर्मान् प्रकारांश्च नो वद स्मार्तमागतम् ।
- 14. पञ्चधावस्थितं धर्मं शृणुध्वं मुनिसत्तमाः ।
- 15. पञ्च प्रकारं धर्म मे वद स्मार्तं यथाक्रमम् ।
- 16. पञ्चधा वर्णितं धर्मं शृणु राजन् समासतः ।
- 17. In Bh.P. vedadharma is clearly a scribe's mistake for varnadharma. Other variants in Bh.P. are sa tatparah for atah param and yathā for tathā in Pulastya.
- 18. A. P. has varnatvamekamāśritya for varnamekam samāśritya. Bh.P. agrees with A.P.
- 19. Adhikāre is a mistake for adhikāraḥ. The second line reads सवर्णाश्रमदण्डस्तु भिक्षादण्डादिको यथा।
- 20. We may conjecture the following restoration for two original verses in Bh.P:

वर्णत्वमेकमाश्रित्य अधिकारे प्रवर्तते ।

(वर्णधर्म : स विज्ञेयो यथोपनयनं त्रिषु॥)

(यस्त्वाश्रमं समाश्रित्य पदार्थः संविधीयते।)

स वर्णाश्रमदण्डस्तु भिक्षादण्डादिको यथा॥

The fourth line can easily be corrected to read as follows:

स उक्तः आश्रमधर्मः (or उक्त आश्रमधर्मस्तु) भिक्षापिण्डादिको यथा।

- 21. Pulastya has -pindādikam for -pindādiko.
- 22. śramatvam may be a mistake for -śrayatvam.
- 23. उभयस्य निमित्तेन यो विधिः संप्रवर्तते। नैमित्तिकः स विजेयः प्रायश्चित्तविधिर्यथा॥
- 24. निमित्तमेकमाश्रित्य यो धर्मः संप्रवर्तते।
 नैमित्तिकः स विज्ञेयो जातिद्रव्यगुणाश्रयः॥
 एष तु द्विविधः प्रोक्तः समासादविशेषतः।
 नैमित्तिकः स विज्ञेयः प्रायश्चित्तविधिर्यथा॥
- 25. The quotation occurring in the commentaries of Kullūka and Maṇirāma also has only one verse of the following form: निमित्तमेकमाश्रित्य यो धर्मः संप्रवर्तते। नैमित्तिकः स विज्ञेयः प्रायश्चित्तविधर्यथा।।
- 26. उभयस्य निमित्तेन यो विधिः संप्रवर्तते। (स वर्णाश्रमधर्मस्त दण्डाद्या मेखला यथा॥)
- 27. A.P. reads *gṛhi* and *yati* for the second and the fourth, which are mentioned as *gṛhastha* and *bhikṣuka* by Pulastya.

28. यथा मूर्धाभिषिक्तस्य प्रजानां पालनं परम् । Kullūka and Maņirāma read paripālanam for pālanam param.

- 29. A.P. 16-17 enumerates eight ātmaguṇas, by possessing which a person goes to the highest place: dayā, kṣamā, anasūyā, anāyāsa, mangalam, akārpaṇya, aspṛhā and śauca. Only three dayā, kṣamā and śauca are common. Other names show significant variations.
- 30. तुल्यार्थाना विकल्पः स्यान्न्यायमूलः प्रकीर्तितः ॥ 24b
- 31. A.P. reads yāgamūlah for nyāyamūlah.
- 32. षाड्गुण्यस्याभिधाने यो दृष्टार्थः स उदाहृतः॥ 5b
- 33. षाड्गुणस्य स्वरूपं तु प्रयोगात् कार्यगौरवात् । समयानामुपायानां योगो व्याससमासतः ॥27 अध्यक्षाणां च निःक्षेपः करणानां निरूपणम् । दृष्टार्थेयं स्मृतिः प्रोक्ता ऋषिभिर्गरुडाग्रज ॥28
- 34. सन्ध्योपास्तिस्तथा कार्या शुनो मासं न भक्षयेत् । अदृष्टार्था स्मृतिः प्रोक्ता मनुना विनतात्मजा ॥29
- 35. स त्रेधा मन्त्रयागाद्यदृष्टार्थ इति मानवाः ॥ 6a
- 36. तुल्यार्थानां विकल्पः स्यान्नचायमूलः प्रकीर्तितः ।
- 37. तुल्यार्थानां विकल्पः स्याद् यागमूलः प्रकीर्तितः ।
- 38. विरोधे तु विकल्पः स्याद् यागो होमस्ततो यथा ।
- 39. वेदे तु विहितो धर्मः स्मृतौ तादृश एव च । अनुवाद स्मृतिः सूते कार्यार्थमिति मानवाः ॥
- 40. गुणार्थः परिसंख्यार्थो वानुवादो विशेषतः ।
- 41. गुणार्थः परिसंख्यातो ब्राह्मणादौ विशेषकः ।
- 42. विशेषदृष्ट एवासौ फलार्थमिति मानवाः ।
- 43. उक्तो धर्मश्च संक्षेपात् परिभाषा च तद्गता । तत्साधनं च देशादि इत्थमित्यब्रवीद् रिवः ॥
- 44. उक्तः पञ्चिवधो धर्मः श्रेयोऽभ्युदयहेतुकः ।
- 45. Studies in the Puranic records on Hindu rites and customs, pp. 185-86.
- 46. Op. cit., p. 188.
- 47. सद्यस्त्वप्रौढबालायामन्यथा वत्सराच्छुचिः । प्रदत्तायां त्रिरात्रेण दत्तायां पक्षिणी भवेत् ॥
- 48. P. 908.
- 49. Nirnayasindhu, p. 372.
- 50. See supra chapter III.A.(2)
- 51. We are alive to the possible criticism that this negative argument is open

to the fallacy of argumentum ex silentio. As Pulastya has not been very widely quoted and topics, on which his special views have been noted, are limited, it may be argued that in comparison with other older and more renowned Smṛti authorities his verses on the five types of dharma and the interpretation of Smṛtis failed to receive recognition. But Hemādri, Caṇḍeśvara and Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa, who knew Pulastya, attribute the verses occurring in the printed Pulastya-upasmṛti to other sources.

- 52. *Dharmaśāstrasangraha*, Ed. Jivananda, Calcutta 1876, Part I, pp. 497-501, 501-44.
- 53. Kane, op. cit, I, pp.266-70. S.C.Banerji has edited it in Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, XXXIX, 1959.
- 54. Hārita, quoted by Caṇḍeśvara, Kṛtyaratnākara, Calcutta 1925, pp. 9-10, mentions four types of dharma: pṛthagdharma, viśeṣadharma, samānadharma and kṛtsnadharma.
- 55. Kane, op. cit., vol. II, p.3 says about the sixfold classification in the *Mitākṣarā*: "This classification appears to have been an ancient one". But he does not record any early reference to it..
- 56. On Manu, II 25.
- 57. XIX 1.
- 58. On Yājīnavalkyasmṛti, I. 1.
- .59. Caturvargacintāmani, Vratakhanda, p. 5.
- 60. Loc. cit.
- 61. Loc. cit.
- 62. I, p. 6.
- 63. Matsyapurāna, 144. 30-31.
- 64. Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra, I. 1. 1-4.
- 65. Mbh., Anuśāsana, 141. 65.
- 66. Matsyapurāṇa, 144. 30-31. Yama, as distinguished from niyama, refers to one of the ten great moral duties which are always to be observed. Niyama refers to a minor observance which is not so obligatory as a yama.

Chapter 5

Pulastyasmrti: (Reconstructed)

संकेत-सूची

अप अपरार्क आभू आचारभूषण आम आचारमयुख कल्यापद्धर्मसर्वस्व कल्यास कातवि कालतत्वविवेचन कामा कालमाधव कालमाधवकारिका कामाका गदाधरपद्धति (आचारसार) गप (आस) चिच चतुर्वर्गचिन्तामणि जयसिंहकल्पद्रुमु जक दार दानरत्नाकर दासा दानसागर घद्वैनि धर्मद्वैतनिर्णय धर्मप्रदीप धप्र निसि निर्णयसिन्धु नृसिंहीय-प्रयोगपारिजात नृप्रपा पुचि पुरुषार्थचिन्तामणि प्रत्र(प्राप्र) प्रदीपत्रय (प्रायश्चित्तप्रदीप)

प्रयोगपारिजात प्रपा प्रायश्चित्तमयूख प्राम बालं भट्टी बाभ मुचि मुहूर्तचिन्तामणि विपा विद्यानपारिजात विश्व विश्वरूप वीमि वीरमित्रोदय शुक्लयजुःशाखीय-कर्मकाण्डप्रदीप शुकप्र

श्राद्धकल्पलता श्राक श्राद्धचन्द्रिका श्राच श्राद्धतत्व श्रात श्राद्धमंजरी श्रामं संकौ संस्कारकौस्तुभ संस्कारपद्धति संप संस्काररत्नमाला संरमा स्मृतिचन्द्रिका स्मृच स्मृतितत्व स्मृत स्मृतिसारोद्धार स्मृसा स्मृतिमुक्ताफल स्मृमु

पुलस्त्य-स्मृतिः

I (धर्मनिरूपणम्)

१ (धर्ममूलम्)

श्रौताणां कर्मणां क्लृप्तिः कल्पसूत्रं तदुच्यते। तथैव गृह्यकल्पानां स्मार्तानामुपसंग्रहः ॥ १ शाखानां विप्रकीर्णत्वात्पुरुषाणां प्रमादतः। नानाप्रकरणस्थत्वात्स्मृतेर्मूलं न लक्ष्यते।।२ धर्मेषु नियता ये वै¹ धर्मशास्त्रार्थचिन्तकाः। वेदशास्त्रविदो ये च तेषां वचनमौषधम् ॥३

२ (ज्ञानकर्मसमायोगः)

ज्ञानकर्मसमायोगात्परं प्राप्नोति पूरुषः।
पृथगभावान्न सिध्यन्ति उभे तस्मात्समाश्रयेत्॥ १
ज्ञानं प्रधानं न कर्महीनं कर्म प्रधानं न तु बुद्धिहीनम्।
तस्मादुभाभ्यां तु भवेत्प्रसिद्धिनं ह्येकपक्षो विहगः प्रयाति॥२

II (आह्निकाचारः)

१ (स्नानम्)

ऊर्ध्व नाभेः करौ मुक्त्वा यदङ्गमुपहन्यते। तत्र स्नानमधस्तात् क्षालनेनैव शुद्धचित॥१ इन्द्रिये च प्रविष्टे स्यादमेध्यं यदि कर्हिचित्। मुखेऽपि संस्पृश्य गतं तत्र स्नानं विशोधनम्॥२ रव्यंगारशनेवरिः स्नानं कुर्वन्ति ये नराः। व्याधिभिस्ते न पीडचते मृगैः केशरिणो यथा॥३ पुष्ये च जन्मनक्षत्रे व्यतीपाते च वैधृतौ। अमावा²यां तु नदीस्नानं पुनात्यासप्तमं कुलम्॥४ अष्टमीरेवतीयोगे तथा चैरावतेऽम्भसि। श्रावणं समनुप्राप्य यत्र क्वचन सङ्गमे।। सर्वा चतुर्दशी पुण्या देविकायास्तथाम्भसि।५ चैत्रक् ³ष्णचतुर्दश्यां यः स्नायाच्छिवसन्निधौ। न प्रेतत्वमवाप्नोति गंगायां च⁴ विशेषतः॥६ शिवलिङ्गसमीपे तु मुच्यते सर्विकल्विषैः। ज्येष्ठमासे सिते पक्षे दशमी हस्तसंयुता॥७ दशजन्माघहा गङ्गा तेन पापहरा स्मृता। आषाढचां सरयूयोगे श्रावण्यां सततं तथा॥८ शिवलिङ्गसमीपे तु यत्तोयं पुरतः स्थितम्। शिवगङ्गेति विज्ञेयं तत्र स्नात्वा दिवं व्रजेत्॥९ कपटेनापि गङ्गायां स्नानदानादि कर्म यत्। यो लाभख्यातिपूजार्थं कुर्यात् सोऽपि दिवं व्रजेत्॥१० चन्द्रसूर्यग्रहे चैव मृतानां पिण्डकर्मणि। महातीर्थे तु सम्प्राप्ते क्षतदोषो न विद्यते॥११

२ (वस्त्रधारणम्)

ईषद्धौतं नवं भ्वेतं सदशं यन्न धारितम्। अहतं तद्विजानीयात्सर्वकर्मसु पावनम्॥१

३ (त्रिपुण्ड्रकम्)

अग्निरित्यादिभिर्मन्त्रैः शुद्धं भस्माभिमन्त्रितम्। शिवमंत्रेण तद्धार्यं मंत्रेणाष्टाक्षरेण वा॥१ गायत्र्या वाथ देवर्षे मन्त्रेण प्रणवेन⁵ वा। करोति शिवमन्त्रेण यस्त्रिपुण्डं द्विजोत्तमः॥२ त्र्यक्षः शूलधरः सौम्यः शिवलोके महीयते। अष्टाक्षरेण मन्त्रेण यः करोति त्रिपुण्ड्कम्॥॥३ विष्णोः पदमवाप्नोति गायत्र्या मुनिसत्तमः । प्राप्नोति ब्रह्मणो रूपं प्रणवेन न संशयः॥४

४ (सन्ध्या)

सन्ध्यामिष्टि चरु⁷ होमं च⁸ यावज्जीवं समाचरेत्। न त्यजेत्सूतके वाऽपि त्य⁹जन्गच्छेदधोग¹⁰तिम् ॥१ सूतके मृतके चैव संध्याकर्म न¹¹ संत्यजेत्। मनसोच्चारयेन्मत्रान्प्राणायाममृते द्विजः॥२ गंगायां शतसाहस्री।३

५ (भोजनम्)

अश्नीयात्तन्मना भूत्वा पूर्वं तु मधुरान्तकम्। लवणाम्लौ तथा मध्ये कटुतिक्तादिकं ततः॥१ भोजनं तु निःशेषं कु¹²यांत्प्राज्ञः कथञ्चन।
अन्यत्र दिधसक्त्वाज्यपललक्षीरम¹³ध्वपः॥२
भुक्त्वोच्छिष्टं समादाय सर्वस्मात्किंचिदाचमन्।
उच्छिष्टभागधेयेभ्यः सोदकं निःक्षिपेद्भुवि॥३
सकृत्पर्वणि सर्वस्य हिवष्यं लघुभोजनम्।
न सायं नोपवासः स्यात्तैलामिषविवर्जितम्॥४
एकादश्यां न भुंजीत नारी दृष्टे रजस्यपि॥५
शङ्खिशुक्तितरङ्गाश्च यच्चान्यत्पानभोजनम्।
दिक्षिणेनैव गृह्णीयान्न वामेन कदाचन॥६

६ (मद्यानि)

पानसं द्राक्षमाधूकं खार्ज्यूरं ता¹⁴लमैक्षवम्। म¹⁵धूत्थं सै¹⁶रमारिष्टं मैरेयं¹⁷ नारिकेलजम्॥१ स¹⁸मानानि वि¹⁹जानीयान्मद्यान्येकादशैव तु। द्वादशं तु सुरामद्यं सर्वेषामधमं स्मृतम्॥२ द्राक्षेक्षुट²⁰ङ्कःखर्जूरप²¹नसादेस्तु यो रस।ः सद्योजातस्तु तं पीत्वा त्र्यहाच्छुध्येद्द्विजोत्तमः॥३

III (देवपूजा)

तेन द्रव्याण्यशेषानि प्रोक्ष्याचम्य पुनर्गृही। ततः कर्माणि कुर्वीत सित्क्रियाश्च द्विजोत्तमः22॥१ पालाशं वटवक्षोत्थमाश्वत्थं शाकवक्षकम्। मृत्तिकौदुम्बरं पीठं माधूकं च विवर्जयेत्॥२ भिन्नपीठानि वर्ज्यानि पितृदैवतकर्मणि। अथ प्रातः उत्थाय भूचिभूत्वा विष्णुं विज्ञापयेत्॥३ यदुद्यमादिकं कर्म तत्त्वया प्रेरितो हरे। करिष्यामि त्वदाज्ञेयमिति विज्ञापनं मम॥४ प्रातः प्रबोधितो विष्णो हृषीकेशेन यत्त्वया। यद्यत्कारयसे कर्म तत्करोमि तवाज्ञया। इति विज्ञाप्य स्तुत्वा वादित्रादिना प्रबोधयेत्॥५ कामः कामप्रियः कान्तः कामपालस्तथा हरिः। आनंदो माधवश्चैव कामसंसिद्धये जपेत॥६ रामः परश्रामश्च नृसिंहो विष्णुरेव च। त्रिविक्रमश्चेत्यादीनि जप्यानि विजगीषुभिः॥७ विद्यामभ्यसतां नित्यं जप्तव्यः प्रुषोत्तमः। दामोदर बन्धगतो नित्यमेव जपेन्नरः॥८ केशवं पुण्डरीकाक्षमनिशं हि तथा जपेत्। नेत्रबाधासु सर्वासु हृषीकेशं भयेषु च॥ ९ अच्यतं चामृतं चैव स्मरेदौषधिकर्मणि। संग्रामाभिमुखो गच्छन् संस्मरेदपराजितम्॥१० चक्रिणं गदिनं चैव शार्ङ्गिणं खङ्गिनं तथा। क्षेमार्थी प्रवसन्नित्यं दिक्ष प्राच्यादिषु स्मरेत्॥११ अजितं चाधिपं चैव सर्वसर्वेश्वरं तथा।

संस्मरेत्पुरुषो भक्त्या व्यवहारेष्ट्र सर्वदा॥१२ नारायणं सर्वकालं क्षुतप्रस्खलनादिषु। ग्रहनक्षत्रपीडासु देवबाधासु सर्वदा॥१३ दस्युवैरिनिरोधेषु सिंहव्याघ्रादिसंकटे। अन्धकारे तमच्छिद्रे नरसिंहमनुस्मरेत्॥१४ तरत्यखिलदुर्गाणि तापार्तो जलशायिनाम्। गरुडध्वजानस्मरणाद्विषवीर्यं प्रशाम्यति॥१५ स्नाने देवार्चने होमे प्रणिपाते प्रदक्षिणे। कीर्तयेदभगवन्नाम वास्देवेति तत्परः॥१६ स्थापने वित्तधान्यादेरवधाने च दृष्टजे। कुर्वीत तन्मना भूत्वा अनन्ताच्युतकीर्तनम्॥१७ नारायणं शार्ङ्गधरं श्रीधरं पुरुषोत्तमम्। वामनं खड्गिनं चैव दुःस्वप्ने तु सदा स्मरेत्॥१८ एकार्णवादौ पर्यङ्कशायिनं च नरः स्मरेत्। बलभद्रं संवृद्धचर्थं निराकर्मणि संस्मरेत्॥१९ जगत्पृतिमपत्यार्थी स्तुवन् भक्त्या न सीदति। श्रीशं सर्वाभ्यदियके कर्मण्यासु प्रकीर्तयेत्॥२० अरिष्टेष्वप्यशेषेषु विशोकं च सदा जपेत्। मरुत्प्रतापा(?-पाता-)ग्निजलबन्धनादिषु मृत्युषु। स्वतन्त्रपरतन्त्रेषु वासुदेवं जपेद्बुधः॥२१ सर्वार्थशक्तियुक्तस्य देवदेवस्य चक्रिणः। यद्वाऽभिरोचते कामस्तत्सवर्थिषु कीर्तयेत्॥२२ सर्वार्थसिद्धिमाप्नोति नाम्नामेकार्थता यतः। सर्वाण्येतानि नामानि परस्य ब्रह्मणो न वा॥२३ कुत्र तिष्ठति गोविन्दो बाह्यार्थहृतचेतसाम्। तस्मान्निःसङ्गचित्तेन शक्यश्चिन्तयितुम् हरिः॥२४

IV (दानम्)

अयने कोटिगुणितं लक्षं च विषुवे फलम्। षडशीत्या सहस्रं तु फलं विष्णुपदीषु च॥१ अयनाशयुतो भानुर्गोले चरित सर्वदा। अमुख्या राशिसङ्कान्तिस्तुल्यकालविधिस्तयोः॥२ स्नानदानजपश्राद्धव्रतहोमादिकर्मभिः। सुकृतं चलसङ्कान्तावक्षयं पुरुषोऽश्नुते॥३ सा²³न्निहत्यमुपस्पृश्य राहुग्रस्ते दिवाकरे। सत्रधर्मप्रवृ²⁴त्तस्य दानकर्म फलैषिणः॥४ अकाले चेत् कृतं कर्म कालं प्राप्य पुनः क्रिया। कालातीतं तु यत्कुर्यादकृतं तद्विनिर्दिशेत्॥५

V (कृष्णाजिनदानम्)

अथातः कृष्णाजिनदानविधि वक्ष्यामः।१ कार्तिक्यां पौर्णमास्यां वैशाख्यां वा चन्द्रसूर्यग्रहे विषुवत्ययनयोवी कृष्णमृगाजिनं सखुरं सशृङ्गमव्रणं मनोहरं हिरण्यशृङ्ग रौप्यखुरं मुक्तालाङ्ग्लभूषितं अन्तर्मासम्बहिर्लीमं प्राक्ग्रीवं २ गोमयलिप्तायां भुवि कुतपानाविस्तीर्य स्यात् । तस्मिन्नाविकं वस्त्रं प्रसार्य तस्मिन्नजिनं हिण्यनाभं कृत्वा तिलैः प्रच्छाद्य तद्रूपं कृत्वा वस्त्रयुगेन तिलान् प्रच्छादयेत्। ३ चतसृषु दिक्षु चत्वारि पात्राणि ताम्ररौप्यकास्यसौवर्णानि यथाशक्तितः पूर्वस्यान्दिशि क्षीरपूर्णं दक्षिणस्यान्दिशि दिधपूर्णं पश्चिमस्यान्दिशि घृतपूर्णम् उत्तरस्यान्दिशि ४ चतसृषु दिक्षु चरस्रो गृष्टी-क्षौद्रपूर्णन्निदध्यात् । र्निदध्यात् । ५ पिवमे भागे सुसिमद्धमिग्नं कृत्वा परिसमूह्य पर्युक्ष्य परिस्तीर्य प्रागेग्रे दर्भे महाव्याहृतिभिस्तिलान् घृताक्तान् जुहुयात् शूद्रस्य नमस्कारेणेति। ६ तत आहिताग्नये ब्राह्मणाय सर्वाङ्गसम्पूर्णाय पात्रसंयुक्ताय विदुषे सर्वगुणाविशिष्ट वस्त्रयुगोपच्छन्नायालङ्कताय दद्यात् क्र25णाजिनं ददामीति। ७ नाभिं स्पृशन्नदितये कृष्णाजिनं प्रति-गृह्णामीति असाविप गृह्णीयात् प्रतिग्रहं वाचयेत् । ८

VI (शुद्धिविचारः)

कण्ठं शिरो वा प्रावृत्य रथ्यापणगतोऽपि वा । अकृत्वा पादयोः शौचमाचान्तोऽप्यशुचिर्भवेत् ॥ १ स्नातकस्य त्रयोऽपाने पञ्चापानेग्निहोत्रिणः । सर्वानेवं गृहस्थेषु शौचकल्पान्नियोजयेत् ॥२

VII (पशुदष्टे शुद्धिः)

वृतस्थं तु शुना दष्टं त्रिरात्रमुपवासयेत्। सघृतं यावकं भुक्त्वा व्रतशेषं समापयेत्॥१ अव्रतः सव्रतो वाऽपि शुना दष्टो द्विजोत्तमः। गवा शङ्गोदकस्नातो महानद्याश्च संगमे॥२ समद्रस्पर्शनाद्वापि शुना दष्टः शुचिर्भवेत्। ब्राह्मणैः रहिते ग्रामे शुना दष्टस्तु ब्राह्मणः॥३ वृषं प्रदक्षिणीकृत्य प्राणायामेन शुध्यति। भवमृगालखरैर्दष्टो ग्राम्यैर्गोवायसैस्तथा॥४, प्रवाहेभ्यो महानद्याः प्राणायामशतं भवेत्। घृतं प्राश्य विशुध्येतु त्रिरात्रोपोषणेन वा ॥५ सुवर्णरजताभ्यां वा गवां शृङ्गोदकेन वा। नवैर्वा कलशैः स्नात्वा चतुर्भिस्तु विशुध्यति॥६ ब्राह्मणी तु शुना दष्टा सोमे दृष्टिं निपातयेत्। वेदविद्यावतस्नातः शुना दष्टस्तु ब्राह्मणः॥७ शतपर्यायमाव²⁶र्त्य गायत्रीं शुद्धिमाप्नुयात्। हिरण्योदकमिश्रं वा घृतं प्राश्य विशुध्यति॥८ रजस्वला यदा दष्टा शुना जम्बुकरासभैः। पञ्चरात्रं निराहारा पञ्चगव्येन शुध्यति॥९ ऊर्ध्व तु द्विगुणं नाभेविक्त्रे तु त्रिगुणं तथा। चतुर्गुण स्मृतं मूर्धिन दे²⁷शेऽन्यत्राशु²⁸चिभवेत्॥१०

VIII (पाषण्डिसंसर्गे शुद्धिः)

श्रतिस्मृत्युदितं धर्मं वर्णाश्रमविभागजम्। उल्लङ्घ्य ये प्रवर्तन्ते स्वेच्छया कृटयुक्तिभिः॥१ विकर्माभिरता मृढा युक्तिप्रागलभ्य दुर्मदाः। पाषण्डिनस्ते दुःशीला नरकार्हा नराधमाः॥२ तास्त पाषण्डिनः पापान्विकर्मस्थाश्च मानवान्। बैडालव्रतिनश्चैव नित्यमेव च नाऽऽलपेत्॥३ संभाष्यैताञ्छु चिषदं चिन्तयेदच्युतं बुधः। इदं चोच्चारयेद्भक्तया कृत्वा तत्प्रवणं मनः॥४ शरीरमन्तः करणोपघातैर्वाचश्च विष्णुर्भगवानशेषम्। शमं नयत्वस्तु ममेह शर्म पापादनन्ते हृदि सन्निविष्टे॥५ अन्तः शृद्धिं बहिः शृद्धिं शृद्धोऽन्तर्मम योऽच्युतः। स करोत्वमले तस्मिञ्शूचिरेवास्मि सर्वदा॥६ बाह्योपघातादनघो विद्वांश्च भगवानजः। शद्धिं नयत्वन्तरा²⁹त्मा विष्णुश्चेतसि संस्थितः॥७ एतत्संभाष्य जप्तव्यं पाषण्डिभिरिहाधमैः। नमः शुचिषदे चोक्तवा सूर्यं पश्येच्च वीक्षितैः॥८ पाषण्डिनो दुराचारा दुष्टान्नगुणवादिनः। असंस्कृतान्नभोक्तारो व्रात्याः संस्कारवर्जिताः॥९ पाषण्डाः पापकर्माणो दाम्भिकाः शठबुद्धयः। वर्णसङ्करकर्तारो धर्मव्याजोपजीविनः॥१० नि:शौचा वक्रमतयो नान्यदस्तीति वादिनः। एवंविधास्ते सन्मागद्विदप्रोक्ताद्बहिष्कृताः॥११ क्रियाकलापं निन्दन्त ऋग्यजुःसामलक्षणम्।

आत्मानं च परांश्चैव कुर्वन्ति, नरकस्थितौ॥१२ तेषां दर्शनसंभाषस्पर्शनानि नरैः सदा। परित्याज्यानि दृष्टे च प्रोक्तं संभाषणे तथा॥१३ संस्पर्शे च बुधः स्नात्वा शुद्धे(ध्ये)च्छुचिषदं स्मरन् । अधमानां सदैवैषामालापस्पर्शनं त्यजेत् ॥१४ प्राकतोऽपि जनः किं तु यः सदाचारपालकः । यतस्ते वैदिकं कर्म निन्दन्त्यकृतबुद्धयः ॥१५ पाषण्डिनामशेषाणामप्रीतिर्वेदकर्मणि । ते ह्यधोगामिनः प्रोक्ता आसुरं भावमाश्रिताः ॥१६ तन्मोहितानामचिराद्विवेको याति संक्षयम् । क्षीणज्ञाना विकर्माणि कुर्वन्त्यहरहर्नराः ॥१७ निजवर्णात्मकं धर्मं परित्यज्य विमोहिताः । धर्मबुद्धचा ततः पापं कुर्वन्त्यज्ञानमोहिताः ॥१८ ज्ञानावलेपस्तत्रैव ततस्तेषां प्रजायते । सुहृद्भिर्वार्यमाणास्ते पण्डितैश्च दयालुभिः ॥१९ प्रयच्छन्त्युत्तरं मूढाः कूटयुक्तिसमन्वितम् । ततस्ते स्वयमात्मानमन्यं चाल्पमतिं नरम् ॥२० विकर्मणा योजयन्तश्च्यावयन्ति स्वधर्मतः॥२१

IX (प्रायश्चित्तम्)

स्त्रीणामर्धं प्रदातव्यं वृद्धानां रोगिणां तथा। पादो बालेषु दातव्यः सर्वपापेष्वयं विधिः॥१ असंस्कृतो निरुत्साहो रोगी नवतिजीवकः। यथाशक्ति प्रयुञ्जीत व्रतं ह्येषु न लुप्यते॥२

X (श्राद्धविधानम्)

१ (अन्त्येष्टिः)

दुर्मृतः सुमृतो वापि पिताग्रे यद्यसंस्कृतः । कालान्तरे मृता माता तस्या दाहादिकाः क्रियाः ॥१ पत्या सहैकचित्या दहेदौपासनादुभौ ॥२

२ (सूतकविचारः)

अम्बुमध्ये गवां गोष्ठे तीर्थेष्वपि न पर्वसु । राहोर्दर्शनकाले च सूतकं नैव विद्यते ॥१ सद्यस्त्वप्रौढबा³⁰लायां प्रौढायां वासराच्छुचिः । प्रदत्तायां त्रिरात्रेण दत्तायां पक्षिणी भवेत् ॥२

३ (तर्पणम्)

मनुष्यतर्पणं कुर्वन्न कंचिज्जानुमा³¹ नमेत् ।१ अन्वाच्य दक्षिणं जानुं प्रागग्रैस्तु कुशैर्द्विजः । देवान् सन्तर्पयेन्नित्यं श्रद्धापूतेन चेतसा ॥२ अन्वाच्य जानुं सव्यन्तु कुशैश्च द्विगुणैरिप । सन्तर्पयेत् पितृन् भक्तया ध्यायंस्तद्भतमानसः ॥३ कृत्वा तर्पणमेवं तु समुत्तीर्यं जलाशयात् । पीडयेत्स्नानशाटीं तु तट³³एव विचक्षणः ॥४

४ (एकोद्दिष्टश्राद्धम्)

एकोद्दिष्टन्तु कर्तव्यं यावित्पत्रोः सिपण्डनम् । ततः सिपण्डनादूर्ध्वमेकोद्दिष्टं निवर्तते ॥१५

५ (सपिण्डीकरणम्)

निरग्निकः स³⁴पिण्डत्वं पितुर्मातुश्च धर्मतः । पूर्णे संवत्सरे कुर्याद्वृद्धिर्वा यद³⁵हर्भवेत् ॥१

६ं (पार्वणश्राद्धम्)

प्रत्यब्दमेतदेकस्य कुर्युः श्राद्धं सुता दश ।
अनिग्नानौरसं (?) च कुर्यात् साग्निस्तु पार्वणम् ॥१
पर्वकालो मृताहश्च यद्येकत्र द्वयम्भवेत् ।
पार्वणं तत्र कर्तव्यं नैकोद्दिष्टं कदाचन ॥२
अमायां वा क्षयो यस्य प्रेतपक्षेऽथवा भवेत् ।
पार्वणं तत्र कर्तव्यं नैकोद्दिष्टं कदाचन ॥३
पितृव्यभ्रातृमान्नृणामेकोद्दिष्टं न पार्वणम् ॥४

७ (श्राद्धदानम्)

संस्कृतं व्यञ्जनाढचं च पयोदिधघृतान्वितम् । श्रद्धया दीयते यस्मात् श्राद्धं तेन निगद्यते ॥१ मुन्यन्नं ब्राह्मणस्योक्तं मासं क्षत्रियवैश्ययोः । मधुप्रदानं शूद्रस्य सर्वेषां चा विरोधि यत् ॥२ वर्जयेद् दूरतः श्राद्धे यदप्रोक्षितमामिषम् ।

राजा(२ज्ञा)नुत्पादितं यच्च व्याधिनाभिहत³⁷ ञ्च यत् ॥३ श्रीपणीं वारुणी क्षीरी जम्बुकाम्रकदम्बकम् । सप्तमं बाकुलं पीठं पितॄणां दत्तमक्षयम् ॥४ युगादिषु मघायां च विषुवत्ययने तथा । भरणीषु च कुर्वीत पिण्डनिर्वपणं न हि ॥५ अयनिद्वतये श्राद्धं विषुवद्वितये त³⁸था । यु³णगादिषु च स⁴णवां⁴ासु पिण्डनिर्व⁴²पणादृते ॥६ एकादश्यां त्रयोदश्यां मघाकृत्तिकयोरिप । पिण्डदानं न कर्तव्यं पुत्रांश्च श्रियमिच्छता ॥७ महालये गयाश्राद्धे गतासूनां क्षयेऽहिन । तन्त्रेण श्रपणं कृत्वा श्राद्धं कुर्यात्पृथकपृथक् ॥८

८ (मातामहश्राद्धम्)

मातुः पितरमारभ्य त्रयो मातामहाः स्मृताः । तेषां तु पितृवच्छाद्धं कुर्युर्दृहितृसूनवः ॥१

XI (संन्यस्तानां श्राद्धविधानम्)

प्रव्रजेद्यदि संसाराद्ब्रह्मविद्यापरायणः । क्टीचको भवेद्वाऽपि यद्वा चैव बहदकः ॥१ हंसो भवेत्ततो ज्ञाने पर(म)43 हंसस्ततोऽधिकः । एकदण्डी त्रिदण्डी वा मनोदण्डी त नित्यशः ॥२ कुटीचकं तु प्रदहेत् पूरयेच्च⁴ बहुदकम् । हंसं जले विनिक्षिप्य पर(म)44 हंसं वि45 दारयेत ॥३ सपिण्डी⁴⁶करणं नैव⁴⁷ सर्वेषां स्मृतिशासनात् । अहन्येकादशे प्राप्ते पार्वणं श्राद्धमाचरेत ॥४ पिण्डयज्ञं सुतः कुर्याद्दर्शश्राद्धं मृतेऽहिन । यतेर्महालये दर्शे वा तस्य मृतवासरे ॥५ पार्वणं स्यादितरेषामेकोद्दिष्टं तु वा भवेत् ॥६ सन्यस्तानां मृते देहे नाशौचं नोदकक्रिया। पदे पदेऽश्वमेधस्य वाहकस्य फलं भवेत् ॥७ विष्णुबुध्या परित्यज्य स्नात्वा गच्छेदगृहं ततः । अशौचबुद्धचा स्नातश्चेदिक्ष्यंत्रं व्रजेन्नरः ॥८ कुटीचको बहूदश्च हंसः परमहंसकः । चतुर्विधानां भिक्षणां एकदण्डित्रिदण्डिनाम ॥९ षोडशानि नवश्राद्धं सपिण्डीकरणं न48 च । एकादशेऽहनि प्राप्ते यदि वा द्वादशेऽहनि ॥१० पार्वणेन विधानेन श्राद्धं कुर्यात्तदौरसः ।११

References

- I. 1.1-2- नृप्रपा पत्र 3; आचारेन्दु (आचारप्रशसा) 4.
- I. 1.3- चिन, परिशेष, काल 285; युचि 268.
- I. 2.1-2- эч 961.
- II. 1.1-2- वीमि शुद्धि 137.
- II.1.4, 3, 6-8a, 9- स्मृच आह्निक 122; 4-6- चचि, परिशेष, काल 709; 7b-
- 8- चिच, परिशेष, काल 710; 4, 6, 8a- आम; 4-आचारेन्दु 52; 6-जक 589, निसि 68; 9- आभू 153; 10-11 प्रात 505.
- II. 2.1- स्मृच आह्निक 113.
- II. 3.1-4- आम 51,65 (1, 2a); शुकप्र 162 (1, 2a).
- II. 4.1-2- अप 893, 50 (1a, 2); स्मृच (आशौच) 74; चिन, परिशेष, काल 696, श्राकल 191, 195 (1), निसि 386, बालभट्टी, प्रायश्चित्त 52 (1, 2), विपा (प्रथम) 247, 271 (1), आभू 88 (1), नृप्रपा 157 (1, 2) निर्णयामृत 269 (1, 2).
- II. 4. 3- तीचि 222.
- II. 5.1- श्कप्र 199.
- II. 5.2-3- स्मृसा (दशम) 293, स्मृच (आह्निक) 224 (2), आम 110 (2), आभू 286 (2), आचारेन्दु 326 (2)
- II. 5.4- स्मृच (आह्निक) 164.
- II. 5.5- स्मृत (प्रथम) 109; पुचि 254, कामा 170, कामाका 33, निसि 34.
- II. 5.6- वीमि (आह्निक) 71.
- II. 6.1-3- अप (प्रायश्चित्त) 1075, मिताक्षरा III, 253; प्राम 101 (1,2), 104 (3); वीमि (शुद्धि) 137 (1,2), कल्यास 399 (1,2), स्मृसा 355 (1,2), गप (आस) 408 (1,2), प्रत्र (प्राप्र) 22 (1,2).
- III. 1- स्मृच (आह्निक) 155; चिच (श्राद्ध) 402.
- III. 2-5- वीमि (पूजा) 96.
- III. 6-23- स्मृच (आह्निक) 188-89.
- III. 24- अप 970.
- IV. 1- स्मृसा 155.
- IV. 2-3- धप्र 10; मुचि 206, 208, 191 (3)
- IV. 4- स्मृच (आशौच) 78; संकौ 62, नुप्रपा 158, श्राक 198.
- IV. 5- स्मृच 162, संप 29, प्रप्रा 391, स्मृमु 15.
- V. 1-8- चिच (दान) 703-5: दार 51a (1-2 upto मनोहरम्); दासा 48 (7-

सर्वगुणविशिष्टं ददामीति)

- VI. 1- आम 22.
- VI. 2- विश्व on I. 17.
- VII. 1-8- अप 1136
- VII. 9-10-प्राम 217, अप 1136(9), संरमा 673 (1, 2)
- VIII. 1-8, 9-16, 17-21- अप 171-72
- IX. 1, 2- अप 1070.
- X. 1.1-2- स्मृच (आशौच) 167; स्मृमु (चतुर्य) 637.
- X. 2.1- श्राक 200.
- X. 2.2- अप 908, निसि 372.
- X. 3.1- आभू 165, आचारेन्दु 221.
- X. 3.2-3- चचि (परिशेष) 932.
- X.3.4- स्मृच (श्राद्धिक) 112, चिच (परिशेष) 907.
- X. 4.1- चिच (परिशेष) 1681.
- X. 5.1- वीमि (समय) 220, निसि 426-27, धहैनि 76-77, पुचि 495, कातिव (हितीय) 495, चिच (श्राद्ध) 192.
- X. 6.1-4- चचि (परिशेष) 1681.
- X. 7.1- श्रात (स्मृत, प्रथम) 189.
- X. 7.2- अप 555, मितांक्षरा 1.260, श्राक 57, स्मृमु (चतुर्थ) 783, निसि 291...
- X. 7.3- वीमि (श्राद्ध) 52-53; चिच (श्राद्ध) 373.
- X. 7.4- निसि 303, श्राक 68.
- X.7.5-7-वीमि (समय) 174,237(6), वीमि (श्राद्ध) 319(6), श्राच 100(5,6), स्मृसा 155,194(6), अप 426(6), निर्णयामृत 190(6),204(6), स्मृमु (चतुथ) 750,761(6), जक 158(6), पुचि 460(6),483(5b-6a),485 (6), श्राक 86-87(6,7), निसि 72(6), स्मृच (श्राद्ध) 23(6),97(6), चिच (परिशेष) 501(6), 587(6), चिच (श्राद्ध) 148(6), 218(6).
- X.7.8- वीमि (श्राद्ध) 318, चिच (परिशेष) 1691, निसि 344; शुकप्र (आहिक) 289.
- X. 8.1- स्मृच (श्राद्ध) 12, चिच (श्राद्ध) 53,66 (1a), कातिव (द्वितीय) 388, धद्वैनि 98, निसि 335, श्राम 17 (1a).

Variant Readings

- 1. पुचि-च
- 2. स्मृच, आम, आचारेन्दु drop -वा-
- 3. चचि जक- तु
- 4. चचि- शुक्लत्रयोद-
- 5. आम- -ण
- 6. आम- -म
- 7. आभू inserts च
- 8. चिच drops च
- 9. निर्णयामृत- यज्ञं नोच्छेदयेद्द्विजः
- 10. समृच, निसि- -द्विजः
- 11. समृच, निसि- समाचरेत्
- 12. स्मृसा -मधूदकैः
- 13. स्मृसा प्राज्ञः कुर्यात्
- 14. अप कौ-
- 15. प्रत्र माध्वीकं
- 16. गप (आस), कल्यास- सौ; प्रत्र सान्नमाध्वीकं
- 17. प्रत्र --रे-
- 18. प्रत्र सामान्येतानिः, स्मृसा- सामान्यापिः, वीमि- समानाति
- 19. प्रत्र जानी-
- 20. Due to scribe's mistake we have -र- for -ट-। प्राय-ङ्कं खर्जूरं प-
- 21. प्राम पानसादेश्च
- 22. चच -माः
- 23. स्मृच सन्निहत्या-
- 24. स्मुच -विष्ट-
- 25. दासा drops कृष्णाजिनं
- 26. MSS - वृत्य
- 27. प्राम दष्टे-
- 28. प्राम -प्लुति-
- 29. अप drops -र-
- 30. निसि -कन्यायां
- 31. आचारेन्द्र- कि-
- 32. आचारेन्द्र- -पातयेत्

- 33. स्मृच- -त
- 34. वीमि, चचि- सह-
- 35. चचि- -दि वा भ-
- 36. निसि- वाऽ-
- 37. वीमि- -ताच्च
- 38. समुच 97- य-
- 39. श्राक, चचि 501- संक्रान्तिषु
- 40. पुचि- 460, निर्णयामृत, स्मृसा- कुर्वीत; श्राक, चिच 501- कर्तव्यं
- 41. समुच 97- -र्वे.-
- 42. समृच 23,97- -र्वा-.
- 43. The reading parahamsa is a mistake for paramahamsa. See v.5.
- 44. बाभ- तु
- 45. बाभ- प्रका-
- 46. बाभ- -ण्डनादि
- 47. बाभ -वेषां स-
- 48. समृच- च न

Chapter 6

Pualstya-upasmrti (text)

पुलस्त्य-उपस्मृतिः

वर्णाश्रमधर्मवर्णनम्

क्रिक्षेत्रे महात्मानं पुलस्त्यम्ष्यो¹ऽबुवन्। तांश्च धर्मान् प्रकारांश्च नो वद स्मार्तमागतम्2॥१॥ एवं पृष्टः प्रत्युवाच सर्वास्तान् पृच्छत³ ऋषीन्। पञ्चधाव⁴स्थितं धर्मं शुणुध्वं मु⁵निसत्तमाः॥२॥ वर्णधर्मः स्मृतस्त्वेक आश्रमाणामतः परम्। वर्णाश्रमस्तृतीयस्त् गुणनैमित्तिकस्तथा ॥३॥ वर्णमेकं समाश्रित्य योऽधिकारः प्रवर्तते। वर्णधर्मः स विज्ञेयो यथोपनयन त्रिषु ॥४॥ यस्त्वाश्रमं समाश्रित्य पदार्थः संविधीयते । उक्त आश्रमधर्मस्तु भिक्षापिण्डादिकं य⁷था॥५॥ उभयस्य निमित्तेन यो विधिः संप्रवर्तते (स वर्णाश्रमधर्मस्तु दण्डाद्या मेखला यथा॥५अ॥ निमित्तमेकमाश्रित्य यो धर्मः संप्रवर्तते।) व नैमित्तिकः स विज्ञेयः प्रायश्चित्तविधिर्यथा ॥६॥ ब्रह्मचारी गृहस्थश्च वानप्रस्थ⁸श्च भिक्षकः। उक्त आश्रमधर्मस्तु राजधर्मस्तु पञ्चमः ॥७॥ वर्णधर्मश्चतुधि तु आश्रमाणां तथैव च । द्वयोः साधारणो धर्मो यश्चासौ द्वयशेषभाक् ॥८॥ इज्याध्ययनदानानि यथाशास्त्रं सनातनम् ।

ब्रह्मक्षत्रियवैश्यानां सामान्यो धर्म उच्यते ॥९॥ याजनाध्या 10पने राज्ञो भूतानां चाभिरक्षणम् । पाशपाल्यं किषश्चैव वैश्यस्याजीवनं स्मृतम् ॥१०॥ शुद्रस्य द्विजशुश्रुषा द्विजानामनुपूर्वशः । श्रा च वृत्तिस्तत्सेवा कारुता¹²रणकर्म(?) च ॥११॥ गरौ वासोऽग्निशश्रषा स्वध्यायो व्रतधारण भ्रम् । त्रिकालस्नायि¹⁴ता भै¹⁵क्ष्यं गुरौ प्राणान्तिकी स्थितिः ॥१२॥ तदभावे गुरुसुते तथा सब्रह्मचारिणि16 । कामतो वा समानत्वं स्वधर्मो ब्रह्मचारिणः ॥१३॥ समेखलो जटी दण्डी मुण्डी 17 गुरुगृहाश्रयः । आ¹⁸विद्यागृहणाद्गच्छेत्कामतो वाश्रमान्तरम् ॥१४॥ अग्निहोत्रोपचरणं जीवन 19 ज्च स्वकर्मि । धर्मदानेषु काम्येषु सर्वत्र जनविक्लि²⁰या (?) ॥१५॥ देवपित्र21तिथिभ्यश्च भूतानाम22नुकंपिता । श्रतिस्मत्यक्तसंस्कारो धर्मोऽयं गृहमेधिनः ॥१६॥ जटित्वमग्निहोत्रित्वं भूशय्याजिनधारणम् । वनेवासः पयोमूलनीवारकणवृत्तिता ॥१७॥ प्रतिग्रहनिवृत्तिश्च त्रिः²³स्नानं मौनधार²⁴णम् । देवतातिथिपूजा च धर्मोऽयं वनवासिनाम् ॥१८॥ सर्वारमभपरित्यागो भैक्ष्यान्न वृक्ष25मूलता । नि²⁶ष्परिग्रहताद्रोहः समता सर्वजन्तुषु ॥१९॥ प्रियाप्रियपरिष्वङ्गः सुखदुःखप्र²⁷कारिता । स बाह्याभ्यन्तरं शौचं नियमो व्रतकारिता ॥२०॥ सर्वेन्द्रियसमाहारो धारणाध्याननित्यता । भावशद्धिस्तथेत्येव परिव्राट्28 धर्म उच्यते ॥२१॥ अहिंसा सत्यवादश्च सत्यं शौचं दया क्षमा ।

वर्णिनां लिङ्गिनां चैव सामान्यो धर्म उच्यते ॥२२॥ स्वज्ञानं हु²⁹दि सर्वेषां धर्मोऽयं वर्णिलिङ्गिनाम् । अदृष्टार्थक्³⁰चैकविधः दृष्टार्थक्च द्वितीयकः ॥२३॥ उभयार्थस्तृतीयश्च न्यायम्लश्चतुर्थकः । उभयव्यवहार्यश्च दण्डधारणमेव च ॥२४॥ (षाड्गुण्यस्याभिधाने यो दृष्टार्थः स उदाहृतः । स त्रेधा मन्त्रयागाद्यदृष्टार्थ इति मानवाः ॥) २४अ॥ तुल्यार्थानां विकल्पः स्यान्न्यायमूलः प्रकीर्तितः । वेदे तु विदितो धर्मः स्मृतौ तादृश एव च ॥२५॥ अनुवाकः श्रुतिः असूक्तं कार्यार्थिमिति मानवाः । गु³²णार्थः³³ परिसंख्यातो³⁴ ब्राह्मणादौ विशेषकः ॥२६॥ विशेषदृष्ट एवासौ फ³5लार्थमिति मानवाः । तदर्थश्च प्रवा³⁶सोऽयं स च सेव्यः फलार्थिना ॥२७॥ उक्तः पञ्चिवधो धर्मः श्रेयोऽभ्युदयहेतुकः । पुरुषाणां यथायोगं स च सेव्यः फलार्थिना ॥२८॥ सद्यस्त्वप्रौढबालायामन्यथा वत्सराच्छु ³⁷चिः । प्रद³⁸त्तायां त्रिरात्रेण दत्तायां पक्षिणी भवेत् ॥२९॥

इति श्री³⁹पुलस्त्यप्रोक्तं धर्मशास्त्रं समाप्तम् ।

K. K. Gopal & Lallanji Gopal

संकेत-सूची

अ = धर्मशास्त्र-संग्रह (सं0 अमरपुरकर) में पुलस्त्यस्मृति ग = स्मृतिसन्दर्भ (गुरुमण्डल सीरिज) में पुलस्त्यस्मृति

 भ0
 पु0
 =
 भविष्यपुराण

 अ0
 पु0
 =
 अग्निपुराण

Varient Readings

- 1. ər drops 5 (luptākāra sign) at all places.
- 2. गु- 0म
- 3. अ- ०तो
- 4. गु- 0घा वा
- 5. गु- द्विज
- 6. गु- 0यं
- 7. गु- त0
- 8. अ- ०स्थोथ
- 9. गु- ०ण य०
- 10. गु- 0ध्ययने
- 11. गु- शूद्रा
- 12. गु- (कारुण्य) कर्म तथैव च। Possibly the reading was कारुकर्म तथैव च।
- 13. गु- 0णि
- 14. गु- ०पि.
- 15. गु- भृत्यै
- 16. अ- णी
- 17. अ- ०ण्डो
- 18. गु- अन्यथा ग्रहण (corrected by editor as गृहमेधित्व)
- 19. अ- ०न वस्व.
- 20. गु- oक्रयाः । Possibly the reading was oक्रिo
- 21. गु- ०त्र्य0
- 22. गु- ०मा०

- 23. अ- স্বি
- 24. अ- ०रिता
- 25. गु- ०त्त.
- 26. अ- निःप्रति(णि)हता
- 27. गु- ०वि०
- 28. गु- ०ड्
- 29. अ- ह्यधि
- 30. गु- ०थों द्विविधः (द्विधा) प्रोक्तो
- 31. गु- ०तिस्०
- 32. गु- omits 26b-27a.
- 33. अ- ०थ
- 34. अ- ०ता
- 35. अ- क0
- 36. गु- ०पा०
- 37. गु- ०च्छ०
- 38. गु- ०दाता या
- 39. गु- omits oश्री

Notes

- क- अ omits it. It begins with श्री गणेशाय नमः।
- ख- Restored on the basis of भ0 पु0
- ग- Restored on the basis of अ

APPENDIX I-A

(अथ पर्वतदानविधानम्)

*भीष्म उवाच । भगवन् श्रोतुमिच्छामि दानमाहात्म्यमुत्तमम् । यदक्षयं परे लोके देवर्षिगणपूजितम् ॥१

^खपुलस्त्य उवाच । मेरोः प्रदानं वक्ष्यामि दशधा मुनिसत्तम । यत प्रसादान्नरो लोकानाप्नोति सुरपूजितान् ॥२ पराणेष य देवेषु यज्ञेष्वायतनेषु च । स तत फलमधीतेषु कृतेष्विह यदश्नुते ॥३ तस्माद्विधानं वक्ष्यामि पर्वतानामनुत्तमम् । प्रथमो धान्यशैलः स्यात् द्वितीयो लवणाचलः ॥४ गुडाचलस्तृतीयस्तु चतुर्थो हेमपर्वतः । पञ्चमस्तिलशैलः स्यात् षष्ठः कार्पासपर्वतः ॥५ सप्तमो घृतशैलश्च रत्नशैलस्तथाष्टमः । राजतो नवमस्तद्वदृशमः शर्कराचलः ॥६ वक्ष्ये विधानमेतेषां यथावदनुपूर्वशः । अयने विषुवे चैव व्यतीपाते दिनक्षये ॥७ शुक्लपक्षे तृतीयायां उपरागे शशिक्षये । विवाहोत्सवयज्ञे वा द्वादश्यामथवा पुनः ॥८ शुक्लायां पञ्चदश्यां वा पुण्यर्क्षे च विधानतः । धान्यशैलादयो देया यथाश्रद्धं विधानतः ॥९ तीर्थे वायतने वापि गोष्ठे वापि भवाङ्गणे । मण्डपं कारयेद्भत्त-या चतुरस्रमुदङ्मुखम् ॥

125 K. K. Gopal & Lallanii Gopal प्रागुदक्प्रवणं तद्वत्प्राङ्मुखो वा विधानतः ॥१० गोमयेनोपलिप्ताायां भूमावास्तीर्य वै कुशान् । तन्मध्ये पर्वतं कुर्यात् विष्कम्भपर्वतान्वितम् ॥११ धान्यद्रोणसहस्रेण भवेद्गिरिरिहोत्तमः । मध्यमः पञ्चशतिकः कनिष्ठः स्यात् त्रिभिः शतैः ॥१२ मेरुर्महावीहिमयस्तु मध्ये सुवर्णवृक्षत्रयसंयुतः स्यात् । पूर्वेण मुक्ताफलवज्रयुक्तो याम्येन गोमेदकपुष्परागैः ॥१३ पश्चाच्च गारुत्मतनीलरत्नैः सौम्येन वैद्र्यसरोजरागैः । शक्तिशिलातलः प्रवाललतान्वितः श्रीखण्डखण्डैरभितः स्यात ॥१४ ब्रह्माथ विष्णुर्भगवान् मुरारिर्दिवाकरोऽप्यत्र हिरण्मयः स्यात् । मूर्द्धव्यवस्था गतमत्सरेण कार्याः सुवर्णेन तथा द्विजौघाः ॥१५ चत्वारि शृङ्गाणि च राजतानि नितम्बभागेष्वपि राजतः स्यात् । आर्द्रेक्षुवंशावृतकन्दरस्तु घृतोदकः प्रश्रवणश्च दिक्ष् ॥१६ भुक्लाम्बराण्यम्बुधरावली स्यात् पूर्वेण पीतानि च दक्षिणेन। वासासि पश्यादथ कर्वुराणि रक्तानि चैवोत्तरतो घनाली ॥१७ रौप्यान्महेन्द्रप्रमुखानथाष्टौ संस्थाप्य लोकाधिपतीन् क्रमेण । नानाफलाली च समन्ततः स्यात् मनोरमं माल्यविलेपनं च॥१८

वितानकं चोपरि पञ्चवर्णमम्लानपुष्पाभरणं सितं च ॥१९ इत्थिन्निवेश्यामरशैलमग्रचं मेरोश्च विष्कम्भिगिरीन् क्रमेण । तुरीयभागेना चतुर्दिशन्तु संस्थापयेत् पुष्पविलेपनाढचान्॥२०

पूर्वेण मन्दरमनेकफलैश्च युक्तं युक्तं गणैः

कनकभद्रककदम्बचिह्नम्।

कामेन काञ्चनमयेन विराजमानमाकारयेत् कुसुमवस्त्र-विलेपनाढचम् ॥२१

क्षीरारुणोदसरसाथ वनेन चैव रौप्येण शक्तिघटितेन विराजमानम् ।

याम्येन गन्धमादनश्च निवेशनीयो गोधूमसञ्चयमयः कलधौतजं वा ॥२२

हैमेन यक्षपतिना घृतमानसेन वस्त्रैश्च राजतवनेन च संयुतः स्यात् ।

पश्चात्तिलाचलमनेकसुगन्धिपुष्पसौवर्णिपप्पलहिरण्मयहंसयुक्तम् ॥२३ आकारयेद्रजतपुष्पवनेन तद्वद्वस्वन्वितं दिधसितोदरसस्तथाग्रे। संस्थाप्य तं विपुलशैलमथोत्तरेण शैलं सुपार्श्वमिप माषमयं सवस्त्रम् ॥२४

पुष्पैश्च हेमवटपादपशेखरन्तमाकारयेत्कनकधेनुविराजमानम्। माक्षीकभद्रसरसा च वनेन तद्वद्रौप्येण भास्करवता च युतं विधाय ॥२५

होमैश्चतुर्भिरथवेदपुराणविद्भिर्दान्तैर निन्द्यचिरताकृतिभिर्द्विजेन्द्रैः । पूर्वेण हस्तमितमत्र विधाय कुण्डं कार्यस्तिलैर्यवघृतेन समित्कुशैश्च ॥२६

रात्रौ च जागरमनुद्धतगीततूर्यैरावाहनं च कथयामि शिलोच्चयानाम् ॥२७

(अथ मेरोरावाहनमन्त्रः।)

त्वं सर्वदेवगणधामनिधेविरुद्धमस्मद्गृहेप्यमरपर्वत नाशयाशु। क्षेमं विधत्स्व कुरु शान्तिमनुत्तमात्र सम्पूजितः परमभक्तिमता मया हि ॥२८ ,
त्वमेव भगवानीशो ब्रह्मा विष्णुर्दिवाकरः मूर्त्तामूर्त्तपरं
बीजमतः पाहि सनातन ।
यस्मात्त्वं लोकपालानां विश्वमूर्तेश्च मन्दिरं रुद्रादित्यवसूनां
च तस्माच्छान्तिं प्रयच्छ मे ॥२९
यस्मादशून्यममरैर्नारीभिश्च समस्तथा
तस्मान्मामुद्धराशेषदुःखसंसारसागरात् ।
एवमभ्यर्च्य तं मेरुं मन्दरं चाभिपूजयेत् ॥३०

अथ मन्दरस्य यस्माच्वैत्ररथेन त्वं भद्राश्वेन वर्षेण च । शोभसे मन्दर क्षिप्रमलं पुष्टिकरो भव ॥३१

अथ गन्धमादनस्य । यस्माच्चूडामणिर्जम्बूद्वीपे त्वं गन्धमादन । गन्धर्ववनशोभावानतः कीर्तिर्दृढास्तु मे ॥३२

अथ विपुलपर्वतस्य । यस्मात्त्वं केतुमालेन वैभ्राजेन वनेन च । हिरण्मयाश्वत्यशिखस्तस्मात् पुष्टिर्धुवास्तु मे ॥३३

अथ सुपार्श्वस्य ।
उत्तरैः कुरुभिर्यस्मात् सावित्रेण वनेन च ।
सुपार्श्व राजसे नित्यमतः श्रीरक्षयास्तु मे ॥३४
एवमामन्त्र्य तान् सर्वान् प्रभाते विमले पुनः ।
स्नात्वाथ गुरवे दद्यात् मध्यमं पर्वतोत्तमम् ॥३५

विष्कम्भपर्वतान् दद्यादृत्विग्भ्यः क्रमशो नृप ।
गावो दद्याच्चतुर्विशदथ वा दश पार्थिव ॥३६
शक्तितः सप्त वाष्टौ वा पञ्च दद्यादशक्तिमान् ।
एकां वा गुरवे दद्यात् किपलां च पयस्विनीम् ॥३७
पर्वतानामशेषाणामेष एव विधिः स्मृताः ॥३८
ग्रहाणां लोकपालानां ब्रह्मादीनां च सर्वशः ॥
स्वमन्त्रेणैव सर्वेषु होमः शेलेषु पठचते ।
उपवासी भवेन्नित्यमशक्तौ नक्तमिष्यते ॥३९
विधानं सर्वशैलानां क्रमशः शृणु पार्थिव ।
दानकालेषु ये मन्त्राः पर्वतेषु च यत्फलम् ॥४०

अथ मन्त्रः । अन्नं ब्रह्म यतः प्रोक्तमन्ने प्राणाः प्रतिष्ठिताः । अन्नाद्भवन्ति भूतानि जगदन्नेन वर्तते ॥४१ अन्नमेव यतो लक्ष्मीरन्नमेव जनार्दनः । धान्यपर्वतरूपेण पाहि तस्मान्नमो नमः ॥४२

अनेन विधिना यस्तु दद्याद्धान्यमयङ्गिरिम् । मन्वन्तरशतं सार्द्धं देवलोके महीयते ॥४३ अप्सरोगणगन्धर्वेराकीर्णेन विराजितः । विमानेन दिवः पृष्ठमायाति सुरसेवितः ॥४४ कर्मक्षयाद्राजराज्यं प्राप्नोतीह न संशयः ॥४५

(अथ लवणाचलदानविधिः)^b

अथातः संप्रवक्ष्यामि लवणाचलमुत्तमम्। यत्प्रदानान्नरो लोकं प्राप्नोति शिवसंयुत²म् ॥१

उत्तमः षोडशदोणः कर्तव्यो 'लवणाचलः। मध्यमः स्यात्तदर्द्धेन चतुर्भिरधमः स्मृतः॥२ वित्तहीनो यथाशत्त्या द्रोणादुर्ध्वं तु कारयेत्। चतर्थांशेन विष्कम्भपर्वतान् कारयेत् पृथक्॥३ विधानं पूर्ववत् कुर्यात् ब्रह्मादीनां च सर्वदा। दद्बद्धेमत⁴रून् सर्वा⁵न् लोकपालनिवेशनम्। सरांसि कामदेवादींस्तद्व च्चात्र निवेशयेत्॥४ कुर्याज्जागरम⁷त्रापि दानमन्त्रान्निबोधत ॥ सौभाग्यर⁰ससम्भूतो यतोऽयं लवणो रसः। तदा त्मकत्वेन च मां पाहि पापान्नगोत्तम॥५ यस्मादन्तरसाः सर्वे नोत्कटा लवणं बिना। प्रियं च शिवयोर्नित्यं तस्माच्छान्तिं प्रयच्छ मे॥६ विष्णुदेहसमुद्भूतं यस्मादारोग्यवर्द्धनम्। तस्मात् पर्वतरूपेण पाहि संसारसागरात्॥७ अनेन विधिना यस्त दद्याल्लवणपर्वतम्। उमालोके वसेत्कल्पं ततो याति पराङ्गतिम्॥८^ग

(अथ गुडपर्वतदानविधिः)°

अथा¹⁰तः संप्रवक्ष्यामि गुड¹¹पर्वतमुत्तमम्। यत्प्रदानान्न¹²रः स्वर्ग¹³माप्नोति सुरपूजितम्॥१ उत्तमो दशभिभरिर्मध्यमः पञ्चभिर्मतः। त्रिभिभरिः कनिष्ठः स्यात्तदर्धेनाल्पवित्तवान्॥२ तद्वदामन्त्रणं पूजा¹⁴होमवृक्षसुरार्चनम्। विष्कम्भपर्वतांस्तद्वत्सरांसि वनदेवताः॥३ होमं¹⁵ जागरणं तद्वल्लोक¹⁶पालाधिवासनम्। धान्यपर्वतवत् कुर्यादिमं मन्त्रमुदीरयेत्॥४
यथा देवेषु विश्वात्मा प्रवरोऽयं जनार्दनः।
सामवेदस्तु वेदानां महादेवस्तु योगिनाम्॥५
प्रणवः सर्वमन्त्राणां नारीणां पार्वती यथा।
तथा रसानां प्रवरः सदैवेक्षुरसो¹७ मतः॥६
मम तस्मात् परां लक्ष्मीं द¹७दस्व गुडपर्वत।
यस्मात् सौभाग्यदायिन्या भ्राता त्वं गुडपर्वत।
निवासश्चापि पार्वत्यास्तस्मान्मा¹७ पाहि सर्वदा॥७
अनेन विधिना यस्तु दद्याद्गुडमयं गिरिम्॥
पूज्यमानः स²० गन्धर्वेगौरीलोके महीयते॥ ८
पुनः कल्पशतान्ते²¹ तु सप्तद्वीपाधिपो भवेत्॥
आयुरारोग्यसंपन्नः शत्रुभिश्चापराजितः॥९

(अथ सुवर्णाचलदानविधिः)^d

अथ पापहरं वक्ष्ये सुवर्णाचलमुत्तमम्।

यस्य प्रदानाद्²² भवनं विरिज्वेयांति मानवः॥१

उत्तमः पलसाहस्रो मध्यमः पज्चिभः शतैः।

तदर्द्धेनाधमस्तद²³ल्पवित्तोऽपि शक्तितः॥२

दद्यादेकपलादूर्ध्वं यथाशक्त्या विमत्सरः॥

धान्यपर्वतवत् सर्वं विदध्याद्रा²⁴जसत्तम।

विष्कम्भशैलास्तद्वच्च ऋ²ऽत्विग्भ्यः प्रतिपादयेत्॥३

यस्मादनन्तफलदस्तस्मात् पाहि शिलोच्चय॥४

नमस्ते ब्रह्मबी²६जाय ब्रह्मग²७भीय वै²९ नमः।

यस्मादग्नेरपत्यं त्वं य²९स्मात् पुण्यं जगत्पते।

है³०मपर्वतरूपेण तस्मात्पाहि नगोत्तम॥५

अनेन विधिना यस्तु दद्यात्कनकपर्वतम्॥

स याति परमं ब्र³¹ह्मलोकमानन्दकारकम्॥६ तत्र कल्पशतं तिष्ठेत् ततो याति पराङ्गतिम्॥७

(अथ तिलशैलदानविधिः)[®]

अथा³²तः संप्रवक्ष्यामि तिलशैलं विधानतः।

यत्प्रदानान्नरो याति विष्णुलोक³³मनुत्त्मम्॥१

उत्तमो दशिभद्रोणैः प³⁴ञ्चिभर्मध्यमो मतः।

त्रिभिः कनिष्ठो वि³⁵प्रेन्द्र तिलशैलः प्रकीर्तितः॥२

पूर्ववच्चापरं³⁷ सर्वं वृक्षविष्कम्भकादिकम्।

दानमन्त्रान्प्रवक्ष्यामि यथावद्रा³⁷जस³⁸त्तम॥३

यस्मान्मधुवने³⁹ विष्णोर्देहस्वेदसमुद्भ्वाः॥

तिलाः कुशाश्च माषाश्च तस्माच्छ्र⁴⁰न्नो भवत्वि⁴¹ह॥४

हव्य⁴²कव्येषु यस्माच्च तिलै⁴³रेवाभिलक्षणम्।

भवादुद्धर शैलेन्द्र तिलाचल नमोऽस्तु ते॥५

इत्यामन्त्र्य च यो दद्यात्तिलाचलमनुत्तमम्।

स वैष्णवं पदं याति पुनरावृत्तिदुर्लभम्॥६

दीर्घायुष्य⁴⁴मवाप्नोति इ⁴⁵ह चामुत्र मानवः।

पितृभिर्देवगन्धर्वैर्पूज्यमानो दिवं व्रजेत्॥७

(अथ कार्पासपर्वतदानविधिः)

ष्कपिसपर्वतस्तदु विश्वभारैरिहोत्तमः। दशिभर्मध्यमः प्रोक्तः कनिष्ठः पञ्चभिः स्मृतः॥१ भारेणाल्पधनो दद्याद्वित्तशाठचविवर्जितः। धान्यपर्वतवत्सर्वमासाद्यं राजसत्तम॥२ प्रभातायान्तु शर्वर्यां दद्यादिदमुदीरयेत्। त्वमेवाचरणं यस्माल्लोकानामिह सर्वदा॥३ कर्पासाचल तस्मात्त्वमघोघध्वंसनो भव। एवं कर्पास्थैलेन्द्रं यो दद्यात् पर्वसन्निधौ॥ रुद्रलोके वसेत्कल्पं ततो राजा भवेदिह॥४

(अथ घृतपर्वतदानविधिः)⁹

अथा¹⁴तः सम्प्रवक्ष्यामि घृत⁴⁷शैलमनुत्तमम्। तेजोऽमृतमयन्दिव्यं महापातकनाशनम्॥१ विंश्त्या घृतकुम्भानामुत्तमः स्यात् घृताचलः। दशभिर्मध्यमः प्रोक्तः पञ्चभिर्वश्यमः स्मृतः॥२ अल्पवित्तः 49 प्रकुर्वीत द्वाभ्यां मेरुविधानतः। विष्कम्भपर्वतांस्तद्वच्चतुभगिन⁵ कल्पयेत्॥३ शालितण्डलपात्राणि कुम्भोपरि निवेशयेत्। कारयेत् संहतान्51 सर्वान् यथाशोभं विधानतः॥४ वेष्टयेत्52 शुल्कवासोभिरिक्षुदण्डफलादिकै:। धान्यपर्वतवच्छेष⁵³विधानमिह पठचते॥५ अधिवासञ्च⁵⁴ कुर्वीत दद्वद्धोमं⁵⁵ सुरार्चनम्॥६ प्रभातायान्तु शर्वर्या गुरवे वि^ऽिनवेदयेत। विष्कम्भपर्वतास्तद्वदृत्विगभ्यः शान्तमानसः॥७ संयोगात् घृतस⁵⁷मुत्पन्नं यस्मादमृततेजसः⁵⁸। तस्माद् घृताचिविंश्वात्मा प्रीयतामत्र शङ्करः॥८ यस्तु तेजोमयं ब्रह्म घृतं तच्च व्यवस्थितम्। घृतपर्वतरूपेण तस्मान्नः पाहि भ्62 धर॥ ९ अनेन विधिना दद्याद्घृताचलमनुत्तमम्। महापातकयुक्तोऽपि लोकमाया⁶³ति शाङ्करम्॥१० हंससारसंयुक्तेन किङ्किणीजालमालिना। विमानेनाप्सरोभिश्च सिद्धविद्याधरैर्वृतः।

विहरेत् पितृभिः सार्द्धं यावदाभू⁶⁴तसंप्लवम्॥११

(अथ रत्नाचलदानविधिः)^h

अतः⁶⁵ परं प्रवक्ष्यामि रत्नाचलमनुत्तमम्। मुक्ताफलसहस्रेण पर्वतः स्यादि होत्तमः॥१ मध्यमः पञ्चशतिकस्त्रिशतेनाधमः स्मृतः। चतुर्थांशेन विष्कम्भपर्वताः स्युः संमन्ततः॥२ पूर्वेण वज्रगोमेदैर्दक्षिणे⁶⁷ इन्द्रनीलकैः। पु⁶⁹ष्परागयुतैः कार्यो विद्वद्भिर्गन्धमादनः॥३ वैदूर्यविद्रुमैः पश्चात् स⁶⁹न्मित्रो विपु⁷⁰लाचलः। पद्मरागैः ससोप 71 र्णोरुत्तरेण तु 72 विन्यसेत्॥४ धान्यपर्वतवत् सर्वमत्रापि परिकल्पयेत्। तद्वदावाहनं कुर्याद्वृ⁷³क्षान्देवांश्च काञ्चनान्॥५ पूजयेत्पुष्यपा⁴नीयैः प्रभाते च विस⁷⁵र्जनम्। पूर्ववद्गुरुऋत्विग्भ्य इमान्मन्त्रानुदीरयेत्॥६ यथा⁷⁶ देवगणाः सर्वे सर्वरत्नेष्वपि⁷⁷ स्थिताः। त्वं च रत्नमयो नित्य⁷⁸मतः पाहि महाच⁷⁹ल॥७ यस्माद्रत्नप्रदानेन वृ⁸⁰ष्टि प्रकुरुते हरिः। म⁸¹हारत्नप्रदानेन तस्मान्नः पाहि प⁸²र्वत॥८ अनेन विधिना यस्तु दद्याद्रत्नमयं गिरिम्। स याति वै⁸³ष्णवं लोकममरेश्वरपूजितः॥९ यावत्कल्पशतं सार्द्ध⁸⁴ वसेदिह⁸⁵ नराधिप⁸⁶। रूपारोग्यगुणोपेतः सप्तद्वीपाधिपो भवेत्॥१० ब्रह्महत्यादिकं कि⁸⁷िज्वद्यदत्रामुत्र वा कृतम्। तत्सर्व्वं नाशमायाति गिरिर्वज्रहतो यथा॥११

(अथ रूप्याचलदानविधिः)

अतः⁸⁸ परं प्रवक्ष्यामि रू⁸⁹प्याचलमनुत्तमम्। यत्प्रदानान्नरो याति सोमलोकं १० द्विजोत्तमः॥१ दशभिः पलसाहस्रैरुत्तमो रा⁹¹जताचलः॥ पञ्चिभर्मध्यमः प्रोक्तस्तदर्द्धेनाधमः १२ स्मतः ॥२ अशक्तौ⁹³ विंशतेरईं कारयेच्छक्तितः⁹⁴ सदा। विष्कम्भपर्वतास्तद्वत्तरीयांशेन कल्पयेत्॥३ पूर्ववद्राजता⁹⁵न् क्यिं⁹⁶द् मन्दरादीन्विधानतः। कलधौतमयांस्तत्र⁹⁷ लोकेशानर्चयेद्बुधः॥४ बह्मविष्णवर्कवान् कार्यो नितम्बोऽत्र हिरणम् ध्यः। ^कराजतं स्याद्यदप्यन्येषां सर्वं तदिह काञ्चनम्॥५ शेष⁹⁹ञ्च पूर्ववत्कुर्याद्धोमजागरणादिकम्। दद्यात्तद्व¹त्प्रभाते तु गुरवे रौप्यपर्वतम्॥६ विष्कम्भशैलान्ऋत्विगभ्यः पू²ज्यवस्त्रविभूषणैः। इमं मन्त्रं पठन् दद्याद्दर्भपाणिर्विमत्सरः॥ ७ पितृणां वल्लभं³ यस्माद्धर्म⁴स्य शङ्करस्य च। रा⁵जत पाहि तस्मान्नः शोकसंसारसागरात॥८ इत्यं निवेश्य⁶ यो दंद्याद्रा⁷जताचलमुत्तमम्। गवायु⁸तसहस्रस्य फलम्प्रा⁹प्नोति मानवः॥९ सोमलोके स10 गन्धर्वैः किन्नरोप्सरसा गणै:। पूज्यमानो वसेद्विद्वान् यावदाभू¹¹तसंप्लवम्॥१० व

(अथ शर्कराचलदानिधिः)

अथातः संप्रवक्ष्यामि शर्कराचल¹²मृत्तमम्। यस्य¹³ प्रदानाद्विष्णवर्करुद्रास्तुष्यन्ति सर्वदा॥१ अष्टाभिः शर्कराभारैरुत्तमः स्यान्महाचलः।

चतुर्भिर्मध्यमः प्रोक्तो भाराभ्यामधमः स्मृतः॥२ भारेण वा15 द्धभारेण कुर्याद्यः स्वल्पवित्तवान्। विष्कम्भपर्वतान् कुर्यात्त्रीयांशेन मानवः॥३ धान्यपर्वतवत् सर्वमासाद्या 16 मरसंयतम्। मेरोपरि तद्वच्च स्थाप्य17 हेमतरुत्रयम्॥४ मन्दारः पारिजातश्च तृतीयः कल्पपादपः॥ एतदवक्षत्रयं मध्नि सर्वेष्वपि निवेरा श्रायेत॥५ हरिचन्दनसन्तानौ पूर्वपश्चिमभागयोः। निवेश्यौ सर्वशैलेषु विशेषाच्छर्कराचले॥६ मन्द19रे कामदेवश्च20 प्रत्यग्वक्त्रः सदा भवेत्। गन्धमादनशङ्गे च21 धनदः स्यादुदङ्मुखः॥७ प्राङ्मुखो वे²²दम्तिंश्च हसः स्याद्विपुलाचले। हैमी सुपार्श्वे सुरभी23 दक्षिणाभिमुखी भवेत्॥८ धान्यपर्वतवत् सर्वमावाहनम24खादिकम्। कत्वाथ25 गुर26वे दद्यान्मध्यमं पर्वतोत्तमम्॥९ ऋत्विगभ्यश्चतुरः शैलानिमान् मन्त्रानुदीरये²⁷त्। सौभाग्यामृतसारोऽयं पर28मं शर्करा29 यतः॥१० तन्म³⁰मानन्दकारी त्वं भव शैलेन्द्र सर्वदा। अमृतं पिबतां ये तु निपेतुर्भुवि सी³¹कराः॥११ देवानां तत्स³²मं सोमं पाहि नः शर्कराचल। म33नो भवधनुर्मध्याद्भृता शर्करा यतः॥ तन्मयोऽसि महाशैल पाहि संसारसागरात्॥१२ यो दद्याच्छर्कराशैलमनेन विधिना नरः। सर्वपाप³⁴विनिर्मुक्तः प्र³⁵याति शिवमन्दिरम्॥१३ चन्द्रादित्यप्रतीकाशमधिरुह्यानुजीविभिः। सहैव यानमा³⁷तिष्ठेत् स³⁸ तु विष्णुप्रचोदितः॥१४ ततः कल्पशतान्ते तु सप्तद्वीपाधिपो भवेत्।
आयुरारोग्यसम्पन्नो यावज्जन्मायु³⁹तत्रयम्॥१५
भोजनं शक्तितः कुर्यात् सर्वशैले⁴⁰ विमत्सरः।
सर्वत्राक्षारलवणमश्नीयात्तदनुज्ञया॥१६
प्पर्वतोपस्करान् सर्वान् प्रापयेद्ब्राह्मालयम्॥१७
पश्येदिमानप्यधनोऽपि भत्त्या
स्पृशेत् मनुष्यैरिह दीयमानान्।
शृणोति भक्तचाथ मति ददाति
निःकल्मषः सोपि दिवं प्रयाति॥१८
दुःस्वप्नं प्रशममुपैति पठचमानैः।
शैलेन्द्रैर्भवभयभेदनैर्मनुष्यः।
यः कुर्यात्किम् मुनिपुङ्गवेह सम्यक्।
सत्वात्मा सकलगिरीन्द्रसम्प्रदानम्॥१९

References

- a चिच (दान) 346-47 (1-10), 348 (11-12), 348 (13-19), 350-51 (20-25), 352-53 (26-27), 353-55 (28-37), 355-56 (38-42), 356 (43-45)
- b. चचि (दान) 360-61. Also मपु 84 (लवणाचलकीर्तनम्)
- c. चिच (दान) 361-62; विपा (चतुर्थ) 138-39. Also मपु 85 (गुडपर्वतकीर्तनम्)
- d. चिच (दान)364-65;विपा (चतुर्थ) 139-40. Also मपु 86(सुवर्णाचलकीर्तनम)
- e. चिच (दान) 366; विपा (चतुर्थ) 140-41. Also मपु 87 (तिलाचलकीर्तनम्)
- f. चिच (दान) 376
- g. चचि (दान) 378-79. Also मपु 87 (घृताचलकीर्तनम्)
- 1. चिच (दान)379-81;विपा (चतुर्थ)143-44.Also मपु 90(रत्नाचलकीर्तनम्)
- i. चिच (दान) 381-82; विपा (चतुर्थ) 145. Also मपु 91 (रौप्याचलकीर्तनम)
- j. चचि (दान) 382-84; विपा (चतुर्थ) 146-47. Also मपु 92

Varient Readings

- 1. मपु- ०काना०
- 2. मप- ०तान
- 3. मपु- ०णैः
- मपु- ०मयान्
- 5. मपु- ०विल्लोकपालान्निवेशयेत्
- 6. मपु- ०दत्रपि कारयेत्
- 7. मपु- ०णं चापि
- मपु- ०सरः सं०
- मपु- ०द्दान कर्तृकत्वकेन त्वं मां पाहि नगोत्तम
- 10. मपु- ०तः परं
- 11. विपा- ०डाचलमनुः
- 12. विपा- ०त्
- 13. विपा- ०गं प्रा०
- 14. मपु- 0जां हे0
- 15. विपा, मपु- ०मजा०
- 16. विपा- ०त्लो०
- 17. विपा- ०सोत्तमः
- 18. मपु- गुडपर्वत देहि वै
- 19. मपु- ०च्छान्ति प्रयच्छ मे

- 20. विपा- सगन्धर्वे गौ₀
- 21. मपु- ततः
- 22. विपा- ₀त् सकलदानस्य फलमाप्यते
- 23. विषा adds one more line by inserting the second part of this line and the first part of the following line as oद्धदृत्विगभ्यः प्रतिपादयेत् । सर्वं वैतत् प्रकृवीत् स्वल्पः
- 24. मपु- ₀न्मुनिपुङ्गव
- 25. चिच wrongly reads ऋत्विग्रभः । विपा- दानमन्त्रमथ शृणु ।
- 26. विपा- oगर्भाo
- 27. विपा- ₀बीजा₀
- 28. मपु- ते
- 29. विपा- पवित्रश्च जगत्यसि
- 30.' मपु- हे₀
- 31. विपा- स्थानं ब्राह्मा₀
- 32. मपु- ₀तः परं प्र₀
- 33. मपु- ०कं सनातनम्
- 34. मपु- मध्यमः पञ्चिभः स्मृतः
- 35. विपा- राजे₀
- 36. मपु- ₀रान्सर्वान्विष्कम्भानभिमतो गिरीन्
- 37. मपु- ₀मुनिपुङ्गव
- 38. विपा- ₀पुङ्गव
- 39. विपा- ₀धे
- 40. विपा- ०च्छान्ता; मपु- ०न्त्यै
- 41. विपा- ₀नित्वति
- 42. मप- ₀व्ये कव्ये च य₀
- 43. मपु- ₀ला एवाभिरक्षणम्
- 44. मपु- ₀ष्यं समाप्नो₀
- 45. विपा- पुत्रपौत्रञ्च; मपु- पुत्रपौत्रैश्च मोदते
- 46. मपु- ०तः परं प्र₀
- 47. मपु- ₀ताचल₀
- 48. मपु- ०स्त्व०
- 49. मपु- ₀त्तोऽपि यः कुर्याद् द्वाभ्यामिह वि₀
- 50. मपु- ₀ण
- 51. मपु- ०नुच्चा०

- 52. मपु- o च्डुo
- 53. मपु- ०षं
- 54. मपु- ₀न पूर्व च
- 55. मपु- मसु०
- 56. मपु- तं नि₀
- 57. मपु drops o सo
- 58. मपु- ०सोः
- 59. मपु- ₀स्मात्ते₀
- 60. मपु- ०द्विद्धचव०
- 61. मपु- ०त्त्वं
- 62. मपु- नोऽनिशम्
- 63. मपु- ₀प्नो₀
- 64. चचि, विपा- ०ह्०
- 65. विपा- ०थातः सं०
- 66. मपु- ₀दनुत्त₀
- 67. मपु- णेनेन्द्र₀
- 68. विपा- पद्मरागैर्युतः; मपु- पद्मरागयुतः
- 69. मपु- संमि₀
- 70. मपु- ∘म₀
- 71. विपा, मपु- ०वर्णै०
- 72. मपु- च
- 73. विद्या- ०द्य०
- 74. मपु- ₀गन्धाद्यैः
- 75. विपा- ०सज्ज; मपु- ०न्यसेत्
- 76. मपु- ₀दा
- 77. मपु- ०वस्थि०
- 78. मपु- ₀त्यं नमोऽस्तु सदाऽचल
- 79. विपा- ०ब०
- 80. मपु- तु₀
- 81. मप- सदा
- 82. विपा- सर्वतः
- 83. मपु- ष्णुसालोक्यम०
- 84. मपु- ०ग्रं
- 85. मपु- o च्वेo

- 86. विपा- ₀पः
- 87. विपा- चेत्स्यादिहाप्यमु.
- 88. मपु- oथातः सं.
- 89. विपा- रौ₀
- 90. विपा- ₀कमनुत्तमम्
- 91./ मपु- र₀
- 92. चचि- ₀रः
- 93. मपु- ₀क्तो
- 94. मपु- ₀तस्त₀
- 95. [−]विपा- ₀रा
- 96. मपु- ₀र्वन्
- 97. मपु- ०द्वल्लो०
- 98. विपा- ₀ण्यम₀
- 99. मपु- षं तु
- 1. मपु- ₀तः प्र₀
- 2. विपा- सम्पूज्य स्रग्वि₀
- 3. मपु-०भो
- मपु- ०रीन्द्राणां शिव₀
- 5. मपु- पाहि राजत तस्मात्त्वं
- 6. मपु- ₀द्य
- 7. मपु- oद्रo
- 8. मपु- ₀मयुतदानस्य
- 9. विपा- ₀मा₀
- 10. विपा- संग₀
- 11. चचि ०ह्०
- 12. मपु- oशैo
- 13. विपा- ₀स्मात्प्र₀
- 14. चचि- ०रः
- 15. विपा- चा₀
- 16. विपा- ०द्य०
- 17. विपा, मपु- ₀प्यं
- 18. मपु- ₀योज₀
- 19. मपु- ०न्द०
- 20. मपु- ₀स्तु

- 21. मपु- तु
- 22. विपा- देव0
- 23. मपु- ₀भिर्द₀
- 24. विपा- ०सुखाः मपु- ०विधानकम्
- 25. मपु- तु
- 26. विपा, मपु- ०रु०
- 27. मपु- ₀यन्
- 28. विपा- ०मः; मपु- ०र्वतः
- 29. विपा- ०राचलः; मपु- ०रायु०
- 30. मपु- ०स्मादान₀
- 31. मपु- शी₀
- 32. विपा- ₀तस,₀; मपु- ₀त्समुत्यस्त्वं
- 33. चचि- मम भुतु मध्या यदुः
- 34. मपु- ०पैर्वि०
- 35. मपु- स याति परमं पदम्
- 36. मपु- ₀न्द्रतारार्कसङ्का₀
- 37. विपा- ₀नं तिष्ठेत्तु
- 38. मपु- ०त्तत्र वि₀
- 39. मपु- oर्ब्दुद0
- 40. मपु- ₀लेष्वम₀

Notes

- क- चिच adds तत्र धान्यपर्वतदानं तावदुच्यते तदेव पद्मपुराणे ।
- ख- चिच begins all the sections with पुलस्त्य उवाच । विपा has पाग्ने पुलस्त्य उवाच ।
- ग- चचि adds इति पद्मपुराणोक्तो लवणाचलदानविधिः ।
- घ- विपा drops the line.
- ङ- चिच adds इति पद्मपुराणोक्तः सुवर्णाचलदानविधिः ।
- च- चचि adds पद्मपुराणात् ।
- छ- चिच inserts पद्मपुराणात्. Here the introductory expression पुलस्त्य उवाच is missing.
- ज- चचि adds इति पद्मपुराणोक्तो रत्नपर्वतदानविधिः ।
- झ- विपा drops this line.
- अ- चिच adds इति पद्मपुराणोक्तो रूप्याचलदानविधिः ।
- ट- विपा, मपु drop verses 17-19

APPENDIX I-B

(अथ पञ्चधेनुदानविधिः)

विधानं तिलधेनोर्यत्तच्छृणुष्व नराधिप । षोडशहाटकमयी धेनुश्चतुर्भिर्वत्सको भवेत् ॥१ इक्ष्दण्डमयाः पादाः दन्ताः पुष्पमयाः शुभाः । नासा गन्धमयी तस्या जिह्वा गुडमयी तथा ॥२ पुच्छे स्रक् कल्पनीया स्यात् घण्टाभरणभूषिता । ईदृशीः कल्पयित्वा तु स्वर्णशृङ्गीं प्रकल्पयेत् ॥३ रौप्यखुरां कांस्यदोहां पूर्वधेनुविधानतः । एवंविधानां तां कृत्वा ब्राह्मणाय तु दापयेत् ॥४ कृष्णाजिनस्थितां धेनुं वासोभिर्भूषितां शुभैः । स्त्रेण स्त्रितां कृत्वा पञ्चरत्नसमन्विताम् ॥५ सर्वौषधिसमायुक्तां मन्त्रपूतान्तु दापयेत् । अन्नं मे जायतां सद्यः पानं सर्वरसांस्तथा ॥६ कामान् सम्पादयास्माकं तिलधेनोर्द्विजार्पिता । गृह्णामि देवि त्वां भत्तन्या कुटुम्बार्थे विशेषतः ॥७ भरस्व कामैर्मा सर्वेस्तिलधेनोः नमोस्तु ते । एवं विधानतो दत्ता तिलधेनुर्नुपोत्तम ॥८ सर्वकामसमावाप्तिं कुरुते नात्र संशयः । जलधेनुस्तथैवेह कुम्भे धेनुः प्रकल्पिता ॥९ दत्ता तु विधिना कामान् सद्यः सर्वान् प्रयच्छति । धेनुश्च तत्त्वतो दत्ता पौर्णमास्यां नराधिप ॥१० पितृस्तारयते दुर्गान्नरकात् कामदा भवेत् । घृतधेनुस्तथा दत्ता विधानेन विचक्षणैः ॥११

सर्वकामं समाप्नोति कुरुते, कान्तिदा भवेत् । रसधेनुं तथा दत्त्वा कार्त्तिके मासि पार्थिव ॥१२ सर्वान् कामानवाप्नोति नित्यं सुगतिभाग्भवेत् ॥१३

References

चचि (दान) 406-7

Notes

क- चिच has इति पद्मपुराणोक्तः पञ्चधेनुदानविधिः ।

APPENDIX II-A

(विश्वव्रतम्)

दशम्यामेकभक्ताशी समान्ते दशधेनवः । दिशश्च काञ्चनीर्दद्यान्नारीरूपा महीपते ॥१ तिलद्रोणोपरिगताः सार्वभौमो भवेन्नृप । एतद्विश्वव्रतं नाम महापातकनाशनम् ॥२ *

References

जक 394

Notes

क- It is introduced as पद्मपुराणोक्त विश्ववृतम्.

APPENDIX II-B

(लक्ष्सीनारायणव्रतम्)

पञ्चदश्यां शुक्लपक्षे फाल्गुनस्य नरोत्तम । पाषण्डपतितांश्चैव तथैवान्त्यावसायिनः ॥१ नास्तिकान्भिन्नवृत्तींश्च पापिनश्चापि नालपेत् । नारायणो गतमनाः पुरुषो नियतेन्द्रियः ॥२ तिष्ठन्व्रजन्प्रस्खलंश्च क्षुते वापि जनार्दनम् । कीर्तयेत्तत्क्रियाकाले सप्तकृत्वः पुनः पुनः ॥३ लक्ष्म्या समन्वित देवमर्चयति जनार्दनम् ॥४ सन्ध्याव्यपरमे चेन्दुस्वरूपं हरिमीश्वरम् । रविं च लक्ष्मीं सञ्चिन्त्य सम्यगर्घ्येण पुजयेत् ॥५ श्रीर्निशा चन्द्ररूपस्त्वं वासुदेव जगत्पते । मनोभिलिषतं देव पुरयस्व नमो नमः ॥६ मन्त्रेणनेन दत्वार्घ्यं देवदेवस्य भक्तितः । नक्तं भुञ्जीत मौनेन तैलक्षारविवर्जितम् ॥७ तथैव चैत्रे वैशाखे ज्येष्ठे च मुनिसत्तम । अर्चयेच्च यथाप्रोक्तं मासि मासि च तहिने ॥८ निष्पादितं भवेदेकं पारणं दालभ्य भक्तितः । दितीयं तत्र वक्ष्यामि पारणं तन्निबोध मे ॥९ आषाढे श्रावणे मासि प्राप्ते भाद्रपदे तथा । तथैवाऽश्वयुजेऽभ्यर्च्य श्रीधरं च श्रिया सह ॥१० सम्यक चन्द्रमसे दत्त्वा भुज्जीतार्घ्यं यथाविधि । द्वितीयमेतदाख्यातं तृतीयमपु पारणम् ॥११ प्रतिपुज्य ततो दद्याद्ब्राह्मणेभ्यश्च दक्षिणाम् ।

प्रतिमासं प्रवक्ष्यामि प्राशनं कायशुद्धये ॥१२ चतुरः प्रथमं मासान्पञ्चगव्यमुदाहृतम् । कुशोदकं तथैवान्यदुक्तं मासचतुष्टयम् ॥१३ गीतवाद्यादिकं रात्रौ तथा कृष्णकथाः शुभाः । कारयेद्देवदेवस्य पारणे पारणे गते । जनार्दनं सलक्ष्मीकमर्चयेत् प्रथमं ततः ॥१४ सश्रीकं श्रीधरं तद्वनृतीयं भूतिकेशवम् । एवं संपूज्यं विधिवत्सपत्नीकं जनार्दनम् ॥१५ नाप्नोतीष्टवियोगार्तिं पुमान् योषिदथापि वा । यावन्ति जन्मान्यसुखं नाप्नोतीष्टवियोगजम् ॥१६ देवस्य तु प्रभावेण मरणे प्राप्नुते स्मृतम् । कुले सतां स्फीतधने भुङ्क्ते भोगान्यथेप्सितान् ॥१७

References

जक 775

Notes

क- जक adds इति विष्णुधर्मोक्तं लक्ष्मीनारायणव्रतम् ।

APPENDIX II-C

(घृतस्नानव्रतम्)

*हादश्या पञ्चदश्या वा गव्येन पयसा हरेः ।
स्नपन दैत्यशार्दूल पहापातकनाशनम् ॥१
हादश्या तुलसीपत्रैर्यः पूजां कुरुते हरेः ।
वैकुण्ठे विपुलान् भोगान् भुत्त्वा सायुज्यमाप्नुयात् ॥२
कार्त्तिकशुक्लद्वादश्या संपूज्य मधुसूदनम् ।
ततस्तु तुलसीपूजां कुरुते यच्छृणुष्व मे ॥३
अतीतजन्मसाहम्रे यत् कृतं पापसञ्चयम् ।
सर्वं तु सहसा दग्ध्वा परं सायुज्यमाप्नुयात् ॥४
अयने चोत्तरे प्राप्ते यः स्नापयति केशवम् ।
घृतप्रस्थेन पयसा सकलैनो व्यपोहति ॥५
घृतस्नानं च देवस्य तस्मिन् काले समाहितः ।
स्नप्यमानं च पश्यन्ति ये घृतेनोत्तरायणे ।
ते यान्ति विष्णुसालोक्यं पूर्वपापविवर्जिताः ॥६
किपलां विप्रमुख्याय ददात्यनुदिनं तु यः ।
स्नानं विष्णोः प्रयच्छन्ति ये घृतेनोत्तरायणे ॥७

References

वीमि (पूजा) 152 (1-6); जक 878 (5, 7).

Notes

क- Introduced as विष्णुधर्मोत्तरे पुलस्त्यः ।

APPENDIX I I I

(तीर्थयात्रापर्व)

ैपुलस्त्य उवाच ।
अनेन तव धर्मज्ञ प्रश्नयेण दमेन च ।
सत्येन च महाभाग तुष्टोऽस्मि तव सर्वशः ॥२२
यस्येदृशस्ते धर्मोऽयं पितृभक्तचाश्रितोऽनघ ।
तेन पश्यिस मा पुत्र प्रीतिश्चापि मम त्विय ॥२३
अमोघदर्शी भीष्माहं ब्रूहि किं करवाणि ते ।
यद्वक्ष्यिस कुरुश्रेष्ठ तस्य दातास्मि तेऽनघ ॥२४

भीष्म उवाच ।
प्रीते त्विय महाभाग सर्वलोकाभिपूजिते ।
कृतिमत्येव मन्येऽहं यदहं दृष्टवान्प्रभुम् ॥२५
यदि त्वहमनुग्राह्यस्तव धर्मभृता वर ।
वक्ष्यामि हृत्स्थं सन्देहं तन्मे त्वं वक्तुमर्हिस ॥२६
अस्ति मे भगवन्किष्चतीर्थेभ्यो धर्मसंशय ।
तमहं श्रोतुमिच्छामि पृथक्सङ्कीर्तितं त्वया ॥२७
प्रदक्षिणं यः पृथिवीं करोत्यमितविक्रम ।
किं फलं तस्य विप्रर्षे तन्मे ब्रूहि तपोधन ॥२८

पुलस्त्य उवाच । हन्त तेऽहं प्रवक्ष्यामि यदृषीणां परायणम् । तदेकाग्रमनास्तात भृणु तीर्थेषु यत्फलम् ॥२९ यस्य हस्तौ च पादौ च मनभ्चैव सुसंयतम् । विद्या तपश्च कीर्तिश्च स तीर्थफलमश्नुते ॥३० प्रतिग्रहादुपावृत्तः सन्तुष्टो नियतः शुचिः । अहङ्कारनिवत्तश्च स तीर्थफलमश्नुते ॥३१ अकल्कको निरारम्भो लघ्वाहारो जितेन्द्रियः । विमुक्तः सर्वदोषैर्यः स तीर्थफलमश्नुते ॥३२ अक्रोधनश्च राजेन्द्र सत्यशीलो दढव्रतः । आत्मोपमश्च भूतेषु स तीर्थफलमश्नुते ॥३३ ऋषिभिः क्रतवः प्रोक्ता वेदेष्विह यथार्क्रमम् । फल चैव यथातत्त्वं प्रेत्य चेह च सर्वशः ॥३४ न ते शक्या दरिद्रेण यज्ञाः प्राप्तुं महीपते । बहुपकरणा यज्ञा नानासंभारविस्तराः ॥३५ प्राप्यन्ते पार्थिवैरेते समृद्धैर्वा नरैः क्वचित् । नार्थन्यनोपकरणैरेकात्मभिरसहतैः ॥३६ यो दरिद्रैरपि विधिः शक्यः प्राप्तुं नरेश्वर । तुल्यो यज्ञफलैः पुण्यैस्तं निबोध युधां वर ॥३७ ऋषीणां परमं गृह्यमिदं भरतसत्तम । तीर्थाभिगमनं पुण्यं यज्ञैरपि विशिष्यते ॥३८ अनुपोष्य त्रिरात्राणि तीर्थान्यनभिगम्य च । अदत्त्वा काञ्चनं गाश्च दरिद्रो नाम जायते ॥३९ अग्निष्टोमादिभिर्यज्ञैरिष्ट्वा विपुलदक्षिणैः । न तत्फलमवाप्नोति तीर्थाभिगमनेन यत् ॥४०

ण्इदं सत्यं द्विजातीनां साधूनामात्मजस्य च । सुहृदां च जपेत्कर्णे शिष्यस्यानुगतस्य च ॥८४ इदं धर्म्यमिदं पुण्यमिदं मेध्यमिदं सुखम् । इदं स्वर्ग्यमिदं रम्यमिदं पावनमुत्तमम् ॥८५

महर्षीणामिदं गृह्यं सर्वपापप्रमोचनम् । अधीत्य द्विजमध्ये च निर्मलत्वमवाप्नयात ॥८६ यश्चेदं शुणुयान्नित्यं तीर्थपुण्यं सदा शचिः । जातीः स स्मरते वहीर्नाकपष्ठे च मोदते ॥८७ गम्यान्यपि च तीर्थानि कीर्तितान्यगमानि च । मनसा तानि गच्छेत सर्वतीर्थसमीक्षया ॥८८ ऋषिभिर्देवकल्पैश्च श्रितानि सुकृतैषिभिः ॥८९ एवं त्वमपि कौरव्य विधिनानेन सवत । व्रज तीर्थानि नियतः पुण्यं पुण्येन वर्धते ॥९० भावितैः कारणैः पूर्वमास्तिक्याच्छ्रतिदर्शनात् । प्राप्यन्ते तानि तीर्थानि सद्भिः शिष्टानुदर्शिभिः ॥९१ नाव्रतो नाकृतात्मा च नाश्चिर्न च तस्करः । स्नाति तीर्थेष कौरव्य न च वक्रमतिर्नरः ॥९२ त्वया तु सम्यग्वत्तेन नित्यं धर्मार्थदर्शिना । पितरस्तारितास्तातं सर्वे च प्रपितामहाः ॥९३ पितामहपुरोगाश्च देवाः सर्षिगणा नप । तव धर्मेण धर्मज्ञ नित्यमैवाभितोषिताः ॥९४ अवाप्स्यसि च लोकान्वै वसुनां वासवोपम । कीर्ति च महतीं भीष्म प्राप्स्यसे भुवि शाश्वतीम् ॥९५

References

- a- महाभारत आरण्यक 80.
- b- महाभारत आरण्यक 85.

Notes

क- महाभारत आरण्यक 80.41 to 85.83 describes various tirthas.

Chapter 8

Sanskrit texts consulted

Ācārabhūṣaṇa of Tryambakarāma, Poona, 1908. Ācāramayūkha of Bhaṭṭa Nilakaṇṭha. Ed. M.G.B.Bakre, Bombay, 1915. Ācārendu of Tryambaka Mate. Ed. D.S.Agashe, Poona, 1909. Agni Purāṇa. Ed. Pancanana Tarkaratna, Vangavasi Press, Calcutta. Aparārka on Yājñavalkyasmṛti. Ed. H.N.Apte, Poona, 1904. Bālambhaṭṭi on Mitākṣarā.Ed. J.R. Gharpure, Bombay, 1914. Bhaviṣyapurāṇa. Kṣemarāja Srikṛṣṇadāsa, Venkatesvara Press, Bombay. Caturvargacintāmaṇi of Hemādri, 4 vols. Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1873-1911.

Dānaratnākara of Candesvara.

Dānasāgara of Ballālasena. Ed. Syāmācrana Kaviratna, Saka 1835-1841.
 Dharmapradīpa of Bhairava Datta Sarma. Ksemaraja Sri Krsnadasa.
 Bombay.

Dharmaśāstra sangraha. Ed.M. S. Amarpurkar.Bombay, 1883. Gadādharapaddhati of Gadādhara Rājaguru. Ed. Sadāśiva Misra. Calcutta. 1904.

Jayasimhakalpadruma. Lakshmi Venkatesvara Press, Kalyan, 1925. Kālamādhava or Kālanirṇaya of Mādhavācārya, Benares, 1909. Kālamādhavakārikā of Vaidyanātha Suri. Alwar.

Kālatatvavivecana of Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa. Ed. Nand Kishore Sharma. Banaras, 1932.

Kalyāpaddharmasarvasva. Sadashiva Sharma, Calcutta, 1933. Mahābhārata, Āranyakaparva.Ed. V. S. Sukthankar, Poona, 1942. Matsyapurāna. Ed. Pancanana Tarkaratna, Vangavasi Press, Calcutta, 1316 B. S.

Muhūrtacintāmani of Rāmadaivajna. Bombay, 1902.

Nirnayāmṛta of Allādinātha. Bombay, 1895.

Nirnayasindhu of Kamalākarabhatta. Ed. Vasudeva Sarma. Bombay, 1906.

Nrsimhiya-prayogapārijāta . Ed.Vasudeva Lakshmana Padasikara, Bombay, 1916.

Padmapurāna. Ed. H.N.Apte, Poona, 1893.

Pradipatraya (Suddhipradipa, Prāyaścittapradipa and Kṛtyapradipa) of Kṛṣṇamitra. Ed. Vishwanath Shastri, Banaras, 1954.

Prāyaścittamayūkha of Bhaṭṭa Nilakaṇṭha. Ed. S.A.Y. Dhupkar, Bombay, 1940.

Puruṣārthacintāmaṇi of Viṣṇubhaṭṭa. Bombay, 1929.

Saṃskārakaustubha of Anantadeva. Bombay, 1913.

Samskārapaddhati of Bhāskara Shastri, Banaras, 1946.

Samskāraratnamālā of Bhatta Gopinātha Dikṣita. Ed. K.S.Agashe & B.S. Phadke, Poona, 1899.

Smṛticandrikā of Devaṇṇabhatṭa, Ed. L. Srinivasacarya: Āhnikakāṇḍa, Mysore, 1914; Āśaucakāṇḍa, Mysore 1921; Srāddhakāṇḍa, Mysore, 1918.

Smrtimuktāphala of Vaidyanātha Dikṣita. Ed. J.R.Gharpure, Bombay, 1937-1940.

Smrtisandarbha (Gurumandal Series), Vol. IV. Ed. M. R. More. Calcutta, 1953.

Smṛtisāroddhāra of Vishvambhara Trivedin, Banaras.

Smrtitattva (Tithitattva, Srāddhatattva and Prāyaścittatattva) of Raghunandana. Ed. Jibananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1895.

Śrāddhacandrikā of Divākara, Banaras, 1956.

Srādhakalpalatā of Nandapandita, Banaras, 1933.

Śrāddhamañjari of Bapu Bhatta Kalakara, Poona, 1960.

Suklayajuhśākhiya- Karmakāndapradipa. Ed. Gangadhar Shastri Datar, Bombay, 1921.

Tirthacintāmaṇi of Vācaspatimiśra. Ed. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitirtha. Calcutta,1912.

Vidhānapārijāta of Anantabhaṭṭa. Taraprasanna Vidyaratna, Calcutta, 1909-1912.

Viramitrodaya of Mitramiśra: Ahnikaprakāśa, Ed. P.N.Sharma, Banaras, 1913; Pūjāprakāśa, Ed. V.P. Sharma. Banaras, 1913; Samayaprakāśa, Banaras, 1935; Śrāddhaprakāśa, Banaras, 1935; Śuddhiprakāśa, Banaras, 1937.

Visnudharmottara Purāṇa. Ksemaraja Srikrsnadasa, Venkatesvara Press, Bombay.